

855.9.17
2 A

10Vh

REFUTATION
OF
SOME OF THE MORE
MODERN MISREPRESENTATIONS
OF THE
SOCIETY OF FRIENDS,
COMMONLY CALLED
QUAKERS;

WITH
A LIFE OF JAMES NAYLER;

By *JOSEPH GURNEY BEVAN:*

ALSO,
(BY PERMISSION OF THE MEETING FOR SUFFERINGS)
A SUMMARY
OF THE
HISTORY, DOCTRINE AND DISCIPLINE OF FRIENDS.

LONDON:
PRINTED AND SOLD BY WILLIAM PHILLIPS,
GEORGE YARD, LOMBARD STREET.

1800.

REPRODUCTION

FROM THE ORIGINAL MANUSCRIPT

SOCIETY OF FRIENDS

OF THE

UNITED STATES

OF THE

A LIFE OF JAMES NAUGHTON

BY JAMES NAUGHTON

AND

OF THE

A SUMMARY

OF THE

OF THE DOCTRINE AND DISCIPLINE OF FRIENDS

LONDON

IN A NEW EDITION, WITH

ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS

1800

10 V 1/2

A
S U M M A R Y
O F T H E
H I S T O R Y , D O C T R I N E S , A N D D I S C I P L I N E
O F
F R I E N D S .

Soc. of

K

Y R A M M S

OF THE

HISTORY, DOCTRINES, AND DISCIPLINE

OF

F R I E N D S

31
SINCE this Refutation went to Press, a Work intitl'd 'A New
' and Impartial History of the Church of Christ,' by T. HAWKES,
has come to the notice of the Author; who takes this opportu-
nity of remarking, that he apprehends there will be found in the
following pages, an answer for so much of that book as con-
tains erroneous assertions respecting the Society of Friends:
most of the general charges of T. HAWKES, against the early
members of that Society, being particularly or virtually dis-
cussed under some one or more of the heads, into which this
pamphlet is divided.

23d 1st Month, 1800.

11
The first Resolution was to report a bill to amend the
and important history of the Church of Christ, as it has been
has come to the notice of the members who take this opportunity
any of connecting, that be represented there will be found in the
following pages, an account of the progress of that work in con-
tains various questions respecting the Society of Friends
most of the general changes of the Church, against the course
members of that Society, long-continued or certainly dis-
cussed under four or more of the heads, into which this
proposition is divided.

2nd 11. 1800.

INTRODUCTION.

WHEN the religious society of Friends first attracted public notice, it had this mark in common with the primitive Christian church, it was every where spoken against. Numerous were the misrepresentations which its enemies poured forth from the press; many of which are now only remembered, or heard of, by the answers which were given to them. Others have still survived, and are occasionally brought forth from their obscurity to answer the purpose of modern malevolence; in which, when they fall into the hands of such as do not know that they have been fully refuted, they are but too successful. There are also some later authors who are not to be suspected of a wish to misrepresent us; but who, drawing their information from unauthentic records, are from time to time adding to the mist with which prejudice delights to keep us surrounded; and causing those who, in their search after truth in matters of religion, might be willing to examine our doctrines in their genuine colours, to turn away in disgust from a people, which, viewed through the medium of misrepresentation, appears little more than a heap of deformity.

We are certainly, compared with the millions of our countrymen, but few in number; the world, in its pursuit of fame, of wealth, and of pleasure, takes little account of us; and the tracts, which, on

particular occasions, have been published by our authors, either to elucidate our doctrines, or to defend them, seldom attract notice enough to be much purchased out of the pale of our own Society. It is not therefore always easy to find the means of setting the public right, when we are sure its credulity is abused. Where few are disposed to listen, small is the encouragement to speak.

I have, however, thought that it might be worth while to review some accounts, that have of later time been given of us. Indeed it seems a duty which we owe to ourselves, and to those, who are liable to be misled by them; and it is possible that a work professing to oppose names of acknowledged eminence, and works which have received the stamp of public approbation, may be read for the sake of the celebrity of the authors whose opinion it controverts; though its own author, and the subject on which he writes, should not otherwise be sufficient to procure notice.

The reader will perceive, as he goes on, the motives which have given rise to a separate account of James Nayler, and to the annexing of the Summary.

REFUTATION, &c.

SECTION I.

MOSHEIM.

IT is not to be wondered at, that Mosheim, in his ecclesiastical history, should have said some things amiss, among the many things which he has said; and as his work is much read, and in general deservedly admired, his ill report extends further, and does more injury, than that of an inferior author. What degree of credit is to be given to that part, which treats of the Society called Quakers, will, I hope, appear from the following remarks: in making which I wish to acquit him of ill will, and to allow for his want of personal acquaintance with his subject, and the strangeness with which the simplicity of a Friend must appear in the eye of a Lutheran.

His account of our origin, needlessly inserted in his history of the Arminians, wherein we are compared to a rank weed, springing up from the neglect of reason, may be passed over, as a rhetorical flourish; inserted to fill up the antithesis, or to serve as a foil to relieve the subject on which he was treating. But, when he makes us his more immediate theme, in whatever he is deficient, or whatever foreign

matter he may have allowed himself to add, we have a right to expect, that in his assertions he be well founded and accurate. In the following passages (taken from MacLaine's 8vo English edit. of 1768) he appears to me to be, either ill informed, inaccurate, or liable to a charge of malevolence, which it is not pleasant to bring against so learned and instructive an author. In page 29, line 2, the Quakers are said to have made use of their pretended inspiration to excite the 'most vehement commotions in church and state.' Now I appeal to the page of English history, and defy any man to show that in the state, any commotions were ever excited by these people, much less (if that were possible) through design. Whitelock, a member of parliament, and a circumstantial recorder of transactions at the time of which Mosheim treats, although he now and then mentions the Quakers, relates no commotion to which they gave rise. As to the church, it is possible, she might be troubled at seeing her authority disputed; but as the avowed ground of all dissent is the apprehension of error in the establishment from which it separates, the Friends must be contented with the common lot of reformers, as to the public opinion.

The next ill founded (or unfounded) assertion of which I shall take notice, is in page 30, line 14, &c. where Mosheim confederates Barclay, Keith, and Fisher, into a triumvirate, in order to raise that beautiful fabric of our discipline, which he seems to think could never have arisen from what he calls the gross ignorance of Fox. As I may have future occasion to vindicate George Fox's memory from this and other aspersions, it will here only be necessary to seek for the authority on which Mosheim rests his assertions. As he cites none,

and in citations he is generally liberal, it is not very unfair to suppose he had none; but as the discipline has been an object of admiration, and George Fox an object of contempt, it was difficult to believe that it had him for its author; and therefore not unnatural to ascribe it to others. Nevertheless, our own historical memoirs do not ascribe the establishment of the discipline, to either of those three persons. If we understand by discipline, either the setting up of the monthly meetings, or the mode of proceeding in them, we have no records from which we can even infer that Barclay, Keith, and Fisher, had any share in it; or that it was not chiefly, if not wholly, brought about by the means of Fox. Indeed it is from his works alone, that we have any clear account of the business. He describes circumstantially his journeys through England, for the purpose of establishing monthly meetings. It was in 1667, the year in which Barclay, then nineteen years old, joined the Society; and whose youth therefore, both as a man and a Friend, makes it improbable he should so soon be a colleague of George Fox. As to Samuel Fisher, he died in 1665, in prison, where he had been about a year and a half; and of about the last four years of his life he was three years and a half in different prisons.* Describing these journeys, George generally uses the plural; but he mentions, on this occasion, no particular persons as companions in the service, as on other occasions he does, particularly in his travels in Germany, &c. where Keith among others is mentioned. William Penn, in his 'Rise and Progress,' &c. gives no coadjutor to Fox; but says that, 'the brethren met him from place to place.' As

* Prefatory Epistle to Fisher's Works, by Ellis Hookes.

to the rules of the Society, whoever will consult the printed collection of them,* will see that they have flowed from time to time, from the yearly meeting itself; but much of the substance of them is to be found in Fox's epistles of 1668, and 1669, in the collection of them printed in 1698, when his memory was still fresh. Penn's account is dated 1694. Fox died in 1690.

At page 33, we are informed of divers intestine disputes which arose among the Quakers; 'which,' says our author, 'were generally terminated in a short time, and without difficulty; as they were about matters of discipline, certain customs and manners, and other affairs of little moment.' Without stopping to consider whether discipline be a thing of little moment or not, it may be observed, that contest is not always easily adjusted, in proportion to the smallness of the matter in dispute; and therefore that it seems probable there was some internal soundness in the constitution of this body, which could thus easily heal after accidental wounds. However, as Mosheim mentions the years in which these differences took place; and, in a note, quotes Sewel (wrong spelled Shewell) as his authority, it may not be amiss to judge of his accuracy by adverting to the history of those years in Sewel; in order to discover whether his recital warrant us to believe, that our early Friends were deficient in 'fraternal charity and union.' In 1656, we find two instances, which are probably those to which Mosheim alludes. One is an account of some extravagant people at Rotterdam, whom, it seems, the magistrates sent to Bedlam. These therefore may be supposed to have bred no schism in the Quaker-

* Extracts from the minutes and advices of the Yearly Meeting, from its first institution. 4to. 1783.

church. The other is the well-known (though ill understood) instance of James Nayler, to whose case I have allotted a special account.* In this place it may suffice to say, that he raised no dispute about either doctrine or discipline; but only was thought to over-rate his own talents, and to be extravagantly admired by others. In doctrine, for any thing that appears, he was an orthodox Friend.

In 1661, Sewel mentions a division raised by the means of John Perrot. This had more the aspect of schism than the preceding; yet I believe it will not be found that it occasioned any separation in the body; and the facility with which it was suppressed, through the assiduity of George Fox, seems to prove, even to those who will not allow a divine interference, either that the body really possessed that energy of health to which I have alluded, or that the 'illiterate, grossly ignorant, melancholy, and fanatical Fox,' (to use the language of Mosheim) was a man of uncommon adroitness in composing differences.†

An actual separation is mentioned, under the year 1683, on account of discipline; some persons refusing to submit to the established rules; and alleging that, seeing all had a measure of the Spirit of Christ within them, they ought not to be subject to their brethren. These went so far as to set up separate meetings; but have by degrees so dwindled away as that (to use the expression of Sewel, whom Mosheim quotes) 'they have vanished like snow in the fields.'

The disturbance raised by Keith, first in America,

* See the Life annexed.

† An Account of this temporary division may be seen in the History of the Life of Thomas Ellwood, anno 1667: the edition of which of 1791, is in print, and some of the older ones to be met with. Ellwood himself had at first joined the dissenters.

and afterwards in England, does indeed appear to have been a matter difficult to adjust; but can scarcely with propriety be called a rent in the body. Let us state the fact, so far as it relates to Keith, in the words of Mosheim. 'Keith was the most learned of the community. By his innovations he excited discord. He was charged with errors in his theology. In his turn he charged the American Friends with unsound doctrine; particularly with considering the whole history of Christ as an allegory.' From this we learn that he was an innovator, and was opposed. His assertions, therefore, about the faith of his American brethren, ought to be received with caution; they might be the artifice of a crafty man to divert the attention of the Society from his own errors; but at any rate they are a foundation too slender for the assertion of Mosheim to rest on; namely, that the American Quakers maintain publicly that Christ never existed but in the hearts of the faithful. Two things prove here was no schism. One is, that Keith, the opponent of the American Friends, was disowned (or as Mosheim has it, excommunicated) by the English Friends, after having pleaded his own cause personally, and resided among them some time; the other, that the Friends of America and Great Britain have kept up, before and since that time, the most brotherly intercourse; preachers from one country have been almost continually travelling, with a cordial welcome, in the other; and the general assemblies of each, particularly the large ones of London and Philadelphia, have all along kept up a harmonious epistolary correspondence. I think, therefore, we may venture to say that, here was no division; to which I shall take the liberty to add, that the account of the American Quakers' disbelief

of Christ's incarnation, is a falsehood. Mosheim indeed would seem to insinuate a like secret opinion in the English Quakers; but no one conversant with their writings can admit the charge: and if the English Friends be cleared from the aspersion, their long continued unity with their transmarine brethren, removes it also from these. As to poor Keith, Mosheim and his translator are at variance respecting the motives of what, Mosheim calls, his return to the bosom of the English church. His uniting with her, for it must be recollected that he had been a Presbyterian, was more likely to have been occasioned by the warmth of her bosom to his declining years, in a country living, than by exasperation at his disownment by the Friends, or reconciliation with a body, from which I apprehend he had never strayed.

The assertion, at page 42, line 20, that they never salute any person they meet by the way, is intirely false. False also is it, that they refuse to appear on behalf of their property before a civil tribunal.* These circumstances are mentioned, untrue as they are, as proofs of an austere, stiff, proud, and formal spirit. The tame relinquishing of their property, and non-resistance of injury, are however ill adduced as a proof of stiffness; nor are the rustic simplicity of their apparel, and the frugality of their tables, mentioned just after, much better selected as instances of their pride. Such are the inconsistencies of writers who meddle with that which they do not thoroughly understand, or investigate. Wiser were it, with the sage of Gay, to say, *mutatis mutandis*:

My pen, with prudent hand, I rein,

For who writes much, must write in vain.

* See more on this subject under the head, *Formey*.

The next page, 43, informs us of a certain council of elders, who seem to regulate all the discipline of the Society. Now this is far from being the case; although there are in the Society certain persons under the denomination of elders. With regard to their office, which is not to interfere in the general purposes of discipline, and for an account of those by whom those purposes are effected, I refer to 'A Summary of the History, Doctrine, and Discipline, of Friends,' which is printed with this; but lest it should be said that the modern practice only is there described, and that Mosheim refers to the ancient one, I may inform my readers, that the embodying of elders for any purpose, did not take place until the present century, namely, about 1727, and that it was not completed until 1754.

One thing more is asserted, respecting the elders, in these words, 'It is well known that in some places these speakers (the ministers) shew their discourses to the ruling elders, before they deliver them;' &c. Which the places are, is not mentioned; but this I may say, that such a practice is not as Mosheim says, 'well known;' and, as one who hath been, for many years, intimately acquainted with the concerns of one large meeting, and much in the way of knowing the general practices of the body, and of those relating to ministers and elders in particular, I may add, that I never knew of any such practice. It may further be noted, that the story supposes our preachers to write their discourses; a thing entirely disapproved by the Society, and repugnant to our principles.

With two more gross misrepresentations I intend to close this part of my remarks on Mosheim. One is the account that, 'there are in some of

'the most considerable congregations, and more
 'especially in those that are erected in London,
 'certain persons, whose vocation it is to be always
 'prepared to speak to the people, to prevent meet-
 'ings from being wholly silent.' The other is that,
 'these appointed speakers have a small salary.'
 From my long residence in London (the chief seat
 of this pretended provision), and personal acquaint-
 ance with all the ministers in it of our Society, I
 can with confidence pronounce the first of these
 to be false; and, being false, the latter falls of
 course.

SECTION II.

IT now remains, to trace my author through other erroneous opinions and descriptions, liberally spread in his text and in his notes; which, with some remarks on the notes added by A. Maclaine, will suffice to show how little dependence ought to be placed on either the learning of the author, or the eloquence of the translator. In this, however, I must be brief. It is well known, that ignorance can ask a question in a minute, which knowledge must take five to answer: so obloquy is generally quicker work than refutation.

It seems common, with the adversaries of Quakerism, to call George Fox a melancholy man. I rather believe him to have been facetious; and I ground my belief on his own journal. Others may judge for themselves.

Sections VI to XI inclusive, give us the author's account of Quaker-doctrines. In these sections much is marked as quotation, but without reference to any author; and is, probably, not any creed of the Quakers, but, a creed for the Quakers, compiled out of the author's apprehension of their tenets. He sets out, in his career of description, with a similitude which he has found between the Quakers and the ancient Mystics: a comparison, however, which, on the whole, does our Friends no injury, although it is not drawn with perfect accuracy. For it appears, from this very ecclesiastical history, that whatever were the failings of the Mystics, they seem not only to have been repositories of genuine piety through the corrupt

and dark ages of the church ; but that in that period of it in which, says our author,* ‘ its corruption was complete, and the abuses that it permitted were gone to the greatest height of enormity,’ ‘ if any sparks of real piety subsisted,’ to continue the use of his own words, ‘ they were only to be found among the Mystics. For this sect, renouncing the subtlety of the schools, the vain contentions of the learned, with all the acts and ceremonies of external worship, exhorted their followers to aim at nothing but internal sanctity of heart, and communion with God, the centre and source of perfection.’

With this comparison then, between Friends and the Mystics, constantly in his mind, it was not very unnatural that he should use their terms, rather than ours, in his display of our doctrine ; although men of tolerably plain understandings, such as our primitive Friends appear to have been, generally know as well as their observers and opponents, what terms will best explain their feelings. Now our primitive Friends, not apprehending themselves to be so much disciples of Origen, as of Jesus Christ, and wishing to vindicate their opinions in terms which the Christian world understood, drew their modes of expression chiefly from the Scriptures. Hence they derived the expressions of Word, Light, Seed, and Christ within ; and not finding in these sacred records such terms as Divine reason, Hidden spark, and Heavenly Sophia, with her Wedding garments, these expressions are sparingly, if at all, used in their writings. Mosheim indeed says, ‘ some of their writers expatiate largely, with the most gaudy and pompous eloquence, on this nuptial attire ;’ but as he doth not mention his author, and my

* Mosheim's History, Vol. III. p. 301.—2d Edition.

reading of Friends' books has not thrown him in my way, I must withhold, for the present, my concurrence with his assertion. After all this colouring of primitive Quakerism, he relates (in a note, page 38) the ignorance of the modern Quakers of the system of their ancestors; and ignorant they certainly are of its Mystic dress; and he adduces Martin and others as a proof of it, for confounding, as he asserts, the innate Divine light of the ancient Quakers, with the operations of the Holy Ghost. Now an explanation of an ancient father, who lived as near to the apostolic days, as Martin did to those of George Fox, would rather have been considered as an elucidation, than a contradiction of apostolic doctrine: and it is probable that some of the confusion which Mosheim thought he saw, arose, as is a frequent case, from his connecting with our doctrines, terms which are not ours.

Our Friends do not, that I recollect, use the word Innate.* They say that, the heavenly gift although *in* man, is not *of* man; and in the journals which some of the more ancient Friends have left behind them, they speak of the first dawnings of the Divine light on their minds. The journals also of such as of later time have left an account in writing of their lives, describe the operation of the principle in a similar manner with those of earlier times; and, I believe, whoever will take the trouble of reading the first pages of several journals of the last century, and the like of several of the present, will be able to judge for himself whether the modern Quakers have misunderstood, or relinquished, the principles of their predecessors.

In the same page with this note, the consequences

* Some sentiments expressive of such a meaning are nevertheless to be found in Hugh Turford's 'Grounds of a Holy Life.'

of the Quaker's principles are professed to be shown; one of which is said to be, that their belief in the in-dwelling (residence in the inward frame is nearer Mosheim's expression) of Christ, draws after it an opinion that the Scriptures do not point out the way of salvation, nor lead men in it. (p. 31, l. 15.) I might deny this consequence, but shall here rely for its confutation, on our author's subsequent words. For he says (five lines further) 'The only advantage, that, in their opinion, results from a perusal of the holy Scriptures, is, that they excite to listen to the dictates of the internal word, and to go to the school of Christ, who teaches within them.' Now if they are allowed to lead men to Christ, they must point out the way, because Christ hath said "I am the way." Mosheim, in this place (as appears by his note at p. 39) does not pretend he is describing what the Quakers really hold; but that which he thinks they must hold consistently with their tenets; but this sample may suffice, to show with what accuracy he draws his consequences; and we may confine our remaining examination to what he asserts to be their belief and their practice. The Ninth Section, therefore, which denies 'the existence of the man Christ Jesus, together with the accounts in Scripture of his divine origin, his life and actions, his satisfaction, merits, and sufferings' to form an essential part of Quaker-theology, as it is founded on the sandy foundation of the preceding one, may be trusted to that for its overthrow; without spending much more time in reviewing it, than has already been allotted to the assertions which it contains, respecting the American Quakers, and the insinuations respecting the English ones. I also pass over the Tenth Section, because, although it doth not describe with accu-

racy, it appears to be clearer than some others from obloquy: and as an account of the mode of worship which is owned by Friends will accompany this work,* the reader may make the comparison for himself.

Some of the falsehoods of the Eleventh Section (at p. 42) have been already noted: it seems therefore only, but scarcely, necessary to observe, that if we take his account of Quaker-morality altogether, it will not subject its professors to censure. First he tells us 'that the faithful are to 'avoid every thing that tends to gratify the external 'senses and passions' (this however is no tenet of the Quakers) 'or,' (and a useful word this, or, is) 'such pleasure is to be so modified by reason and 'meditation, as to prevent its debasing and corrupting the mind.' This latter alternative, which I believe no Friend will disclaim, is so much like what the apostle James calls, 'to keep himself unspotted by the world,' that if the poor Quakers do but also "visit the widows and fatherless in their "affliction," it will be hard for such as our author to deny, that they have arrived at the substance of true religion.

The Twelfth Section contains some falsities, which have been already spoken to; and some inaccuracies respecting discipline which may be rectified by turning to the account in the Summary.

* See the Summary annexed, Ch. III.

SECTION III.

I HAVE already testified my readiness to believe that the account of our Society by Mosheim, fraught as it is with inaccuracy, may, nevertheless, not be intentionally malevolent: it is to be remembered that he lived at a distance from the places where the members of the Society which he was describing had their abode; and his literary friends in England were, probably, such as were themselves but little acquainted with our principles. This I am warranted in supposing, from having frequently observed how little even some of our countrymen, with whom we daily converse, enter into an examination of our motives: which, as formerly they had the lot to be misrepresented and traduced, because our manners were dissimilar to those of the age, and novel; so now these seem to have become too familiar, to excite much curiosity respecting the principles from which they arise. We are just considered as a good sort of people in the main, who refuse to fight, and to swear, and to pay tithes; and while the improved manners of the age allow that for these, and other singularities, we ought not to be molested, the public in general cares little further about us; and seldom inquires a reason of the hope that is in us. But the excuses which I willingly seek for Mosheim, I cannot so readily find for his translator. Archibald Maclaine is a Briton; a resident in the country, in which our Society took its origin, and in which, when he prepared his translation, as at present, it subsisted.

It behoved him therefore, when he found in his author so distorted a portrait, to have inquired, to have seen, whether it were a true resemblance of the original; and not himself to have heightened the caricature. Let us begin with his note respecting the character of Fox, whom he labours to represent as a man of a turbulent spirit. The first part of the note gives an account of an anonymous defender of the Quakers, who had represented Fox as a meek, contented, easy, steady man. The testimony of this author Maclaine rejects, because he supposes him to draw his account from Penn, who was intimate with Fox; and from Ellwood, who had been in his company. Maclaine however chooses to refer us to Sewel, from whose history he selects three instances of Fox's opposition to 'ministers in the public celebration of divine service, at Nottingham, Mansfield, and Market Bosworth.' I shall not stop long to inquire whether the sermon be a part of divine service; nor to admit that Fox frequently, in the early part of his career, did promulgate his doctrines in the public places for worship; but, as the passages are short, shall lay the words of Sewel before my readers. The transactions are all of the year 1649, and may therefore easily be found in any edition of Sewel. Mine is the first English one, 1722. Nottingham — he 'went away to the 'steeple-house, where the priest took for his text 'these words of the apostle Peter.' "We have "a most" (probably a mistake for, more*) "sure "word of prophecy, whereunto ye do well that ye "take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark "place, until the day dawn, and the day-star arise in

* It seems, by the way, not easy, in our translation, to find what constitutes the comparison, in this passage.

“your hearts.” * And he told the people that this
 ‘ was the Scripture, by which they were to try all
 ‘ doctrines, religions, and opinions. G. Fox hearing
 ‘ this, felt such mighty power and godly zeal work-
 ‘ ing in him, that he was made to cry out, O! no,
 ‘ it is not the Scripture, but it is the Holy Spirit, by
 ‘ which the holy men of God gave forth the Scrip-
 ‘ tures, whereby opinions, religions, and judgments,
 ‘ are to be tried. That it was it, which led into all
 ‘ truth, and gave the knowledge thereof. For the
 ‘ Jews had the Scriptures, and yet resisted the Holy
 ‘ Ghost, and rejected Christ, the bright morning
 ‘ star, and persecuted him and his apostles; though
 ‘ they took upon them to try their doctrine by the
 ‘ Scriptures; but they erred in judgment, and did
 ‘ not try them aright, because they did it without
 ‘ the Holy Ghost. He thus speaking, the officers
 ‘ came and took him away and put him in a nasty
 ‘ stinking prison.’ Before I proceed, I would just
 remark how little Mosheim, when he said that the
 modern Quakers misapprehend the doctrines of
 their ancestors, &c. (see his note at page 38) would
 have thanked his translator for referring to this
 passage. Sewel adds that the sheriff who examined
 Fox, [was so little apprehensive of his turbulence,
 that he] took him to his own house from the com-
 mon prison; that he was so much affected with
 the interview, that he sent for a woman with whom
 he had traded, confessing that he had wronged
 her, and must make restitution; and that he and
 some others were moved to exhort the people to
 repentance. Such were the effects of Fox’s decla-
 ration, whether turbulent or otherwise.

The account Sewel gives of the transaction at
 Mansfield is this. ‘ Whilst G. Fox was in this
 ‘ place, he was moved to go to the steeple house, and

‘ declare there the truth to the priest and the people;
 ‘ which doing, the people fell on him, and struck
 ‘ him down, almost smothering him, for he was
 ‘ cruelly beaten and bruised with their hands, bibles,
 ‘ and sticks. Then they haled him out, who was
 ‘ hardly able to stand, and put him into the stocks,
 ‘ where he sat some hours: and they having brought
 ‘ horse-whips, threatened to whip him. After some
 ‘ time they had him before the magistrates, at a
 ‘ knight’s house: who seeing how ill he had been
 ‘ used, set him at liberty, after much threatening.
 ‘ But the rude multitude stoned him out of the
 ‘ town.’ Here was certainly turbulence; but I
 think the passage not well adduced to prove it
 upon Fox.

Respecting Market Bosworth, Sewel gives this
 short relation—‘ Coming into the public place of
 ‘ worship, he [G. F.] found Nathaniel Stevens
 ‘ preaching, who was priest of the town where
 ‘ G. Fox was born; here G. Fox taking occasion to
 ‘ speak, Stevens told the people he was mad, and
 ‘ that they should not hear him; though he had
 ‘ said before to one colonel Purfoy, concerning him,
 ‘ that there was never such a plant bred in England.
 ‘ The people now being stirred up by the priest, fell
 ‘ upon G. Fox and his friends, and stoned them out
 ‘ of the town.’

MacLaine’s note at page 28 contains several parti-
 culars. The first, about a naked woman, is men-
 tioned without authority. I shall not take upon
 me to determine whether it be manufactured out
 of a story in Whitlock’s memorials, of the preacher
 in Whitehall being disturbed by a Quaker, whom
 Cromwell ordered to be taken before a magistrate.
 The story about the man with a drawn sword, is
 also in Whitlock; but my readers may judge

whether he were one of a people who disclaim the use of arms. As to T. Adams (Aldam, I believe) he appears, in foretelling the downfall of Cromwell, to have been a true prophet;* and our own accounts of him mention both his denunciation against Oliver, and the manner of it, by tearing his own cap. The story also of the woman who went into the parliament-house, is recorded by Sewel, speaking of 1658; and the speedy accomplishment of her prophecy, seems to affix no stigma on the society which reckoned her among its members. Sewel doth not mention her name; but says simply this—‘A certain woman came once into the parliament with a pitcher in her hand, which she breaking before them, told them, so should they be broken to pieces; which came to pass not long after.’† But of all the persons, who, under the name of Quakerism, have been supposed to give occasion for the outcry of fanaticism, James Nayler is to our detractors the favorite object of attack; and they seem to think the charge made good by merely recurring to his name. But I believe if we draw our account of Nayler from no better authority than A. Maclaine’s note, we shall be at some loss for what particulars to criminate him; or to join with the annotator in pronouncing him ‘the most extravagant Quaker that appeared in this time.’ He tells us (from Neal’s history of the Puritans, and from an account of Nayler’s trial) that Nayler was a man of parts, and so much admired by ‘these fanatics’ (meaning the Quakers) that they blasphemously gave him sundry extravagant titles. He afterwards speaks of certain letters, full of blasphemous absurdity, written by Hannah Stranger, Richard Fairman, and others; and all this

* Sewel, 185.

† Ibid.

while he does not tell us a word of what poor Nayler said or did on the occasion. So that it would seem that to be called by blasphemous titles is to be more extravagant than to give them. But the fact is, both Nayler and his wild admirers were disclaimed by the Quakers. The latter indeed were persons of so little note, that their names would scarcely have survived to this time, but for the injury which they did by their flattery to Nayler; whom Maclaine allows to have been a sensible man, and some of whose writings show him to have been a meek one.*

The notes (r) at page 31, and (t) at page 32, relate to the character of Penn. What is asserted in them, respecting his intimacy with Peters the Jesuit, and his embassy to Holland, is drawn from Burnett; who is, I believe, the only voucher for them. With regard to his vanity, he certainly seems not to have consulted it, when in early life he abandoned, for his religion, the patronage of the king's brother, heir, and the high admiral of his realm. His stile may yet be judged of by his numerous writings. I have already touched upon the account of Keith, and scarcely think it material to make any addition.

* For further particulars respecting James Nayler, see his life annexed.

SECTION IV.

FORMEY.

THE misrepresentations of Friends in Formey's ecclesiastical history were rather diffusely animadverted on, several years ago, in an anonymous pamphlet, entitled 'A Letter to Dr. Formey,' printed for Nicoll, London, 1766;* and I believe it will be found that many of the foregoing remarks on the account given by Mosheim, are equally applicable to this author, whose narrative in great measure seems to be taken from that of the learned professor.

The charge of turbulence on the character of George Fox; the pretended origin of the Quakers' tenets, as drawn from those of the ancient Mystics; the accusing them of depreciating the Scripture, and some of them of making the incarnation of Christ no more than an allegory; the account of their having persons always prepared to speak in their religious assemblies; and that they reject all which may confer pleasure upon sense; are fallacies which I need not again refute. But there are a few things, in that part of Formey's account which relates to the rise and progress of the Society, which do claim some particular attention and reply. He says that the Quakers in the time of Charles I. 'dared to interrupt the public worship, and furiously 'attacked those who celebrated it,' (p. 240, Vol. 2. English translation, London, Davis, 1766). The

* My copy is the Second Edition.

first account we have of any person, afterwards called a Quaker, interrupting a minister in his sermon, is that mentioned by Maclaine, respecting George Fox at Nottingham.* This was in 1649, as were the occurrences at Mansfield and at Bosworth. Charles I. was beheaded in 1648; and the name of Quaker was imposed in 1650. It is probable that the words 'and furiously attacked those who celebrated it,' may not have been intended to mean a personal assault; but they convey such a meaning, however adverse to the practice of a people which Formey justly represents (page 245) as refusing, on any occasion, to fight.

'The order that Cromwell re-established in the state,' continues Formey, 'repressed the impetuosity of these madmen, who, under the pretence of obeying the Spirit, disregarded all laws, both divine and human. He found it necessary to lay aside all lenity, and inflicted the heaviest punishments.' This, if true, would seem to show the opinion of a cotemporary, and, waiving his political character, a person of no mean abilities, respecting the Quakers; but it is far from truth. During the Commonwealth, Friends were indeed severely persecuted; but it was generally under the pretence of vagrancy, many of them being concerned to travel for the promulgation of their doctrines; and not by any new act of the parliament, none having been made respecting them; or by any edict of Cromwell, for that was an authority which he did not assume. On the contrary, although he is charged with conniving at those severities which he might have restrained; he himself forebore any attempt to punish, in cases which fell under his immediate notice. Two of them

* See Page 18 to 19.

may serve as instances. Edward Burrough, a most zealous preacher among Friends (who in the time of Charles II. ended his days in prison) wrote thus to Cromwell in 1655 : ‘ That the Lord’s controversy was against him, because he had not been faithful in God’s work; but that he had taken his rest and ease upon a lofty mountain of pride and vain glory, having set up himself to be worshipped, and exalting his own horn, without giving glory and honour to God—that he had not performed his vows made to the Lord in the day of distress; and that now he suffered grievous oppression, cruelty, and tyranny, to be acted in his name, by unjust imprisonments, and persecution of the Lord’s people. That therefore the Lord would bring his judgments upon him, except he did repent.’* No punishment to Burrough was consequent of this bold remonstrance—and it confirms my opinion that Cromwell was not personally rigorous to the Friends of that day. They blamed him rather for not preventing, than for inflicting, punishment.

Those who have written concerning the Quakers generally agree in giving to George Fox, the pre-eminence of being the founder of the Society; and there is little reason to doubt that he was considered such by the nation at large, in 1654. Had Cromwell therefore formed a design of suppressing the Friends, and had determined to attempt it by the heaviest punishments, he scarcely would have let slip an opportunity of letting the weight of his displeasure fall upon Fox: and the rather as he certainly had been an eminent opposer of the ministers, and was taxed with it by Oliver himself. Nevertheless we find him on most occasions ready to attend to the applications of Fox. In this year,

* Burrough’s Works, Folio, 97. Sewel, 122.

Fox was taken up at Whetstone in Leicestershire, as he was about to go to a meeting, by some troopers of colonel Hacker's regiment. There was at that time some talk of a plot against Cromwell. The colonel wished to persuade G. Fox to remain at home, and not to frequent meetings. With this condition he refused to comply, on which Hacker sent him a prisoner to the Protector. The first effect of this arrest was a requisition on Oliver's part that Fox should sign a paper, promising not to take up a carnal weapon against him or the government, with a liberty for Fox to put it in such words as he chose. With this he complied, disclaiming the use of an outward weapon against any man.* He had (the same day, I think) an audience of Cromwell, the particulars of which are not to our present purpose, but the conclusion of it is remarkable. I give it in the words of Fox; and I hope the account of one who is esteemed the chief of a persecuted people, may be taken in favour of the man, of whom they complain, for not using his power to restrain the rage of their oppressors. 'People coming in,' says G. Fox (Journal, folio, 1694, p. 138) 'I drew a little back; and as I was turning he caught me by the hand, and, with tears in his eyes, said, "Come again to my house, for if thou and I were but an hour of a day together, we should be nearer the one to the other;" adding that he wished me no more ill than he did to his own soul. I told him, if he did, he wronged his own soul: and I bid him hearken to God's voice, that he might stand in his counsel and obey it; and if he did so, that would keep him from hardness of heart; but if he did not hear God's voice, his heart would be hardened. And

* See more on this subject under the head Encyclopædia.

‘ he said it was true. Then I went out, and when
 ‘ captain Drury (who had brought him to town
 from Hacker, and was in Cromwell’s guards)
 ‘ came out after me, he told me his lord protector
 ‘ said I was at liberty, and might go whither I
 ‘ would!’

Having dispatched the times of Cromwell, our academician proceeds to inform us that the ‘ fury’ of the Quakers was softened by degrees, and that under the reign of Charles II. there was *no subject of complaint* against them. Yet he tells us that the king was not well disposed towards them, as they refused to take an oath on any occasion whatever. These two assertions do not well accord with each other, as they certainly do not with truth. The legislature in this reign, whether founded or not, did complain of the Quakers, when it made a law entitled ‘ An Act for preventing mischiefs and ‘ dangers that may arise by certain persons called ‘ Quakers and others, refusing to take lawful oaths.’ They are also mentioned unfavourably in one or both of the Acts in this reign for suppressing conventicles.

As to the king, it is probable that he troubled himself very little about them, except when particular application was made to him. On one hand, he gave his assent to the laws by which they were persecuted; and on the other, he listened to the complaints of their grievances, which they preferred to him: particularly in 1661, when he put a stop to the capital punishments which were inflicted on them in New England; and in 1672, when he released about four hundred who were prisoners in Great Britain, by a pardon under the Great Seal.* An account of this transaction, and a

* See the Summary, and Sewel, in loc.

copy of the pardon may be seen in George Whitehead's Journal, entitled his Christian's Progress: in which also are accounts of other instances of the personal civility of Charles II. to the people called Quakers. The check which the king gave to the New England persecutors, was at the instance of Edward Burrough, before mentioned, to whom, as well as to several other friends, he gave an opportunity of conference with him.

It may not be necessary to contradict every assertion which this author makes; but I shall just mention one more, relating to the civil conduct of the Society, which is certainly erroneous. He says 'they never go to law, or take upon themselves any office of civil society.' The fact is that they are restrained by the rules of their discipline, from suing each other at law, and enjoined to refer their differences to arbitration. If either party refuse to comply with either of these regulations, or, having complied, to abide by the award, the rules direct that he shall be disowned; in which case the other party is at liberty to pursue his remedy at law: and members of this Society, as they are liable to be called into courts of law by their fellow subjects, are certainly not debarred their privilege, as Englishmen, of being plaintiffs; neither do they always decline to exercise it.

As to the other part of the assertion, they certainly fill many offices of civil society, as trustees, assignees, executors, guardians, arbitrators, managers of public charities, and the like. If our author means offices in parishes, wards, hundreds and counties, in which they are less frequently found than others, it must be recollected that either the oath which is the admission to such offices, or something to be performed in them incon-

sistent with a Friend's scruples, is the cause of his avoiding them; and not a desire to withhold his share of service from the community. When no such impediments subsist, our Friends have not commonly shown such a disposition to withhold their services; as appears by the stations they often filled in the government of Pennsylvania; and we not unfrequently find them in this country in some public offices, particularly in those of overseer of the poor, and surveyor of the high ways: and it probably has been so from their beginning, for our writings, I think, mention instances of their being troubled when chosen to offices, before the affirmation was legally current in any case. John Whiting, one of our early historians, mentions himself being an overseer in 1679.*

From the first appearance of *our* Society, numerous have been the aspersions casts on us by those of others. But I must be allowed to say that much of the slander which we have suffered, has been either occasioned by inferences drawn by our enemies from our acknowledged belief, which we ourselves by no means subscribe to; or by urging us on points not immediately connected with our main doctrine, and concerning which the experience of many centuries has shown that pious men have not been able to agree. Of the latter sort are the clamours which have been raised against us for heterodox opinions concerning the Divine and the human natures of Christ, and the manner of their union. By Formey we are said to attribute to Christ a double body: from what authority, as he does not mention, I cannot investigate. But it

* Persecution exposed in some memoirs of the sufferings of J. Whiting and many others of the people called Quakers, in the west of England, 1715—reprinted 1791.

should be remembered that the object of Friends' doctrine (or to speak more in their own language of their mission) was not to controvert or to establish opinions on those points which had long, and (if we may judge from the little love that attended the discussion), vainly, occupied mankind; but, without denying the orthodox belief, whatever it might be, to turn men's attention to one, which had been too much overlooked. The affirming therefore of Christ within, was in addition to the belief of his life and sufferings at Jerusalem; and certainly doth no more contain a denial of them, in a greater or less degree, than the discovery of some quality of superior excellence in any man, would draw after it a belief that he had lost all the excellence which we had allowed him to possess before. With regard to the charge of our undervaluing the Scripture, it has been ably replied to by many of our authors, as it is by the anonymous examiner of Formey already mentioned.

These remarks may serve as a caution to the reader, against taking on trust what he may find stated by various authors, as Quaker-principles, when they do not refer to acknowledged writings of our own: and with this, after I have obviated one more assertion, I shall take my leave of Formey. He says (p. 244) that the Quakers 'allow that a man cannot possess this light, unless he mortifies the flesh, and weakens the power of his senses.' I think this is Monkery, and not Quakerism. They assert with the Scripture, "that the light shineth in darkness," and say that it not only discovers the sins of the flesh, but gives power to subdue them. According to Formey, a man must first overcome all his evil propensities; and so, as it is the province of Christ "to destroy the works of the devil,"

be in some sort, and primarily, his own Saviour; and then he will receive the heavenly visitant. Not so say the Quakers', or the Scripture. What was Paul, before he was enlightened? A persecutor. What was Felix, when he trembled with conviction? A lascivious Gentile.

SECTION V.

HUME.

IT is difficult to give a serious refutation of an account in which truth and falsehood, jest and seriousness, are so blended as they are in that which Hume gives of our religious society, in his History of England. I had therefore put together a few jocose remarks on it, as the properest answer to such a motley performance. But seeing religion itself is not a proper subject for a jest, so neither is he, who is so far mistaken as to joke with its professors. I therefore destroyed my essay, and now propose briefly to show how inadequate Hume was, in the rallying temper he assumed, when he dashed out his account of the Quakers, to give such a history of a people who were his cotemporaries, as should add credit to his recital of events long past. His account of George Fox is seasoned with that kind of hyperbole, which gives a relish to light discourse; but doth not bear the strictest inquiry, or furnish the truest information. So that when he at once says the Quakers began with the lowest vulgar, and had George Fox, a shoe-maker, for their founder, that Fox-long wore leather for the sake of singularity, and never dwelled a moment in a place, we may pass these and other flourishes as figures of his rhetoric, and proceed. But when he tells us, that all the ceremonies which were invented by pride and ostentation, were rejected by Fox and his disciples, from motives of superior pride and ostentation, we may question his power

of penetrating into their motives, and withhold our assent.

His account of the origin of the name Quaker, is not that which the Society itself hath handed down to it; see the 'Summary,' nor doth his account of their fury in breaking into churches (as they are termed), well agree with what he acknowledges of their patience under suffering. That they crept into the army after they joined our Society, I believe to be untrue. That several of the early Friends had been in it, is true: also that some, probably whilst in it, received their doctrines. But as the laying aside of arms was their constant practice, it is more probable that they left it as soon as they could.* The following are gross inaccuracies. Hume might not, possibly, know better; but a writer who neglects to procure the information which he might easily obtain, deserves the less excuse for his ignorance. 'Each rose up in his place (viz. in their meetings), and delivered the extemporary inspirations of the Spirit.' Again, 'Sometimes a great many preachers were moved to speak at once.'

The story of the fasting Quaker is cited from Whitlock, who reports it, like a newspaper, as intelligence from Colchester, in 1655. This was the year in which, according to Sewel, James Parnel died, in the castle there, of sheer ill usage; to palliate whose cruel treatment, it was given out that he had injured himself by fasting, and afterwards by immoderate eating. I will not affirm that the story was made out of this; but there seems enough in this, for it to pick up the rest by the

* Several, however, remained in the army until Cromwell, in 1654, required an oath of them, when, on their refusal, they were disbanded. Sewel, Book 3, beginning.

way from Colchester to Whitehall. The other story of the naked female is already spoken to, under the head, Mosheim. I have there also touched upon James Nayler's case, but having endeavoured to give it a particular elucidation,* it may now be left, with remarking, that it doth not appear he ever did fancy himself transformed into Christ, and become the Saviour of the world; and that Nayler himself, as well he might, denied the story of raising Dorcas Erbury from the dead; and further, that if this unworthy Dorcas *swore* that he had done it, it may serve to show in some degree what sort of people they were who led James Nayler aside; seeing genuine Quakers refuse to swear.

* See the life annexed.

SECTION VI.

THE ENCYCLOPÆDIA BRITANNICA.

I DO not know that the editors of the Encyclopædia Britannica can be reckoned misrepresentors of the society of Friends; for they candidly extract from the 'Summary,' already mentioned, our own account of our peculiar tenets; but they preface this account with so unpleasant a character of George Fox, as is not likely to give their readers much predilection for a body, of which he is said to be the founder. In our own language, however, we chuse to call him simply the first. The determined opposition which G. Fox gave to some of the religious and civil practices of the nation, has made it current to charge him with fanaticism and turbulence; and the evident deficiency of human learning, which is every where to be observed in his writings, have occasioned the outcry against him to be mixed with strains of contempt. In this cry our Encyclopædists have joined; or rather, after it had subsided, they have raised it again: from what motives they should know best; but probably not to recommend the history of a people which they describe as composed of rational beings; and on which, in some instances, they bestow their commendations. It falls out, however, very well for the memory of George Fox, that they have not been contented to calumniate him in general terms; but for proof have adduced two charges from books which bear his name, and

one from a manuscript letter, said to be written by him to Oliver Cromwell.

Let us then examine the validity of the sources from which their information is drawn: and to this investigation they themselves furnish a clue, by saying they have received it from the 'theological works of Mr. Leslie.'

It may not be much amiss, at setting out, to examine what sort of a man this Leslie was; for we shall find that one of the charges will principally rest on his candour and veracity. He was, at the time he became an anonymous champion for the Episcopalians against the Quakers, a nonjuring clergyman, in the reign of King William: and one cannot indeed wonder that he did not like such a mild prince; for he says, (Reply to Anguis Flagellatus, p. 330.) speaking of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, and her persecution of the Anabaptists, 'There was an age when some zeal was shewn against them. The 24th November, 1538, four Dutch Anabaptists bare faggots at Paul's cross, and the 27th November, two Dutch Anabaptists were burnt in Smithfield.' And so he goes on to recount how four more were burnt in these zealous times; and that at length, the queen commanded the whole schismatic corps to depart the realm in twenty days, upon pain of imprisonment and forfeiture of goods and chattels. He does not even tell us of an act of parliament; 'But,' he goes on, 'when these guards (i. e. faggots, fire, and banishment,) were taken away, and the Dutch toleration was made a precedent for the English reformation, in the grand schism and rebellion of 41, then the flood gates of the infernal pit being fully set open, the sun and the air were soon darkened with the smoke' (i. e. dissenters.) I pass by some further anala-

gous epithets, and hasten to the consequence, which he says was, that ‘the monster came to its full growth of deformity in the Quakers.’ Which, though it was ‘farrowed in Holland, and sent to be nursed in England, was begot by Rome. For John Beccold, the ‘tailor of Leyden, or John Matthias, the baker of ‘Harlem, and other mechanicks, who led the dance ‘in Dutch land, were as incapable of themselves, to ‘have broached these heresies, as our cobbler G. Fox, ‘and other rascally vermin, tinkers, tailors, and ‘fidlers, who danced after their pipe here.’ In these quotations, I have not intentionally added or displaced a word; and have only omitted for brevity’s sake, where the context was more swelled with intolerance, or abuse, than is necessary for our purpose. Here then we perceive that Charles Leslie was what is called a high churchman, an approver of persecution, and, I think I may add, without abuse of words, a virulent opposer of the Quakers. It appears therefore that we are to receive what he says with many grains of doubt: and one would wonder that the editors in this polite and enlightened age, should accept his testimony.

They have however drawn forth from the mud of his page, three charges against George Fox, with which they present us, as if they were unanswerable: and here I may again observe, that it is the duty of those who undertake to assert upon the word of an enemy, not to omit to inquire if nothing has been, or can be, said on the other side.

The first charge is this: ‘In a book called, *News out of the North*, (page 15) he says of himself, “I am the door that ever was, the same Christ yesterday, to-day, and for ever.” Thus the Ency-

clonædia. To refute this charge, it is only necessary to recite the passage as it stands in the book itself, printed in 4to. 1654.

‘ Now to all dear ones I speak. The same seed
 ‘ (which is Christ), the same spirit, takes upon it
 ‘ now as ever was. The same world is now as
 ‘ ever was. The same temptations and the same
 ‘ devils, and the same worship of the world, twining
 ‘ into another form and colour. And Jesus Christ
 ‘ is the way, the truth, and the life. He is the
 ‘ door that all must pass thro’, and he is the
 ‘ porter that opens it. I am the same door that
 ‘ ever was: the same Christ to-day, yesterday, and
 ‘ for ever.’ John ix. 6. Ibid. x. 13. Luke xi. 4.

After observing that the references to John and Luke, are taken from the margin of George Fox’s book, (which is printed in so indistinct a manner, as would at this time scarcely be admitted), I think we may pass to the next charge, which stands thus: ‘ In the introduction to his ‘ Battledoor for
 ‘ Teachers and Professors, he says, “ All languages are to me no more than dust, who was
 “ before languages were.”

It may be premised, before I endeavour to clear up this passage, which I am willing to confess is a likely one to occasion censure, that the popular expression, George Fox’s Battledoor, is inaccurate (‘ his Battledoor,’ say our editors). Let us hear what Fox himself says of it (Journal, 8vo. vol. 1. p. 245. 1st edit. 1694), ‘ John Stubbs and
 ‘ Benjamin Furly took great pains in the compiling
 ‘ of it, which I put them upon ; and some things I
 ‘ added to it.’ He does not say which parts he added, and he has not (that appears by my copy) signed the introduction; though he was generally (as we may shortly see) liberal of his G. F’s. The sen-

several of the
 tence in the handle of almost every battledoor
 has his name; and they are about fifteen or
 sixteen in number. The sentence he signs is simply
 this, 'The light which Christ hath enlightened
 'you withal, believe in; that the anointing within
 'you, you may know to teach you.' It is already
 granted that the expression in question is liable to
 exception; but I think when we construe it by the
 context, the fairest way of interpreting that which
 is obscure in the writings of deceased authors, some
 of the difficulty ceases. It should be remembered
 that the main tenet, on which George Fox and his
 friends insisted, was the infinite superiority of the
 Spirit to the letter. The learned of that day, as
 of other times, valuing themselves on their know-
 ledge of languages, despised our Friends for their
 ignorance; these in return frequently decried
 human learning, to a degree in which, probably,
 they would not have slighted it, if they had not
 thought it to be set too much in competition with
 the knowledge of divine things, which they be-
 lieved the soul to receive by immediate internal com-
 munication with the Mediator, Christ. 'All lan-
 'guages' says a * writer in this introduction, 'are to
 'me no more than dust, who was before languages
 'were.' He immediately goes on, 'and am come'd
 'before languages were, and am redeemed out of
 'languages into the power where men shall agree;
 'but this (meaning the battledoor) is a whip and a
 'rod (alluding to the correction of children) to all
 'such who have degenerated through the pride and
 'ambition from their natural tongues and lan-
 'guages, and all languages upon the earth is but
 'natural, and makes none divine, but that which

* The Introduction does not appear to be all written by one hand.

‘ makes divine is the word, which was before
‘ languages and tongues were.’

Such is the paragraph which so much offended the orthodox Leslie. I cannot probably prove that it was not written by Fox ; on the other hand, I presume that none of his opponents can prove that it was. I finish the subject with mentioning and remarking on a note which a person, who had been perusing this introduction, and who appears to have thought Fox the author of the passage in question, fixed into the copy in his possession. ‘ I have here taken the liberty to make a supplement to G. F’s elliptical paragraph: as Malachi iii. 10. “ All languages are to me no more “ than dust,” *being come to him* “ who was before “ languages were, and am come’d” *to the power “ which was* “ before languages were; and am re- “ deemed out of languages into the power where “ men shall agree,” &c. This, by high churchmen, will be thought a lame way of bringing off the writer of the introduction; and therefore the annotator reminds such, that as great a liberty appears to be taken with their Bibles. The latter part of verse 10 of the 3d of Malachi runs in English thus: — “ if I will not open you the windows of “ heaven, and pour you out a blessing, that *there “ shall not be room enough to receive it.*” Now omit the words in Italics, and it runs thus, “ and pour you “ out a blessing that not enough.” In Mark xiii. 34. the translators have prefixed “ *For the Son of “ Man is:*” words which even the English text doth not seem to want; for I suppose no one will tell us that Mark in his original copy inserted the marks of parenthesis in the 35th verse, in which is a proper antecedent to the word “ he” in the 36th. The reader will also find a notable Italic addition

to 1 John ii. 23. If then such liberties may be taken with the Scriptures, which, say our opponents, are the word of God, I think they must not refuse us the privilege of explaining, by similar means, the writings of a more modern teacher, be he saint or enthusiast.

SECTION VH.

THUS far, though we follow Leslie in the maze of calumny, we have this to guide us—the original editions of the works to which he refers; but in his next charge, we must take his word. That is, we must admit a priest of a persecuting spirit to be impartial evidence against a dissenter; and an assertor of the divine right of tithes,* against one who struck at their root. For the Encyclopædists copy their third charge from Leslie only, in whose works, say they, stands a letter from George Fox to the protector, containing the following expressions. ‘I, who am of the world called G. Fox, doth deny the carrying or drawing any carnal sword against any, or against thee, O. C. or any man, in the presence of the Lord I declare it, God is my witness, by whom I am moved to give this forth for the truth’s sake, from him, whom the world calls G. Fox, *who is the Son of God*, who is sent to stand a witness against all violence, and against the works of darkness, and to turn the people from darkness to light, and to bring them from the occasion of the war, and from the occasion of the magistrates sword, which is a terror to the evil doer, which acts contrary to the light of the Lord Jesus Christ.’ They quote more of the letter, but, I think, this contains all their charge of blasphemy; for though they have marked with Italic, further on in the letter, the words ‘*my kingdom* (meaning the kingdom I am of) *is not of this world*,’ as they are no more than any redeemed

* Leslie wrote a book on the Divine Right of Tithes.

mind may say, I think we may let that pass without remark.

Now as Leslie's is the only copy of this letter pretended to be extant, that I know of, let us examine how he came by it. He says, he saw it in a manuscript of one Humphry Norton, which manuscript was printed at London, 'for so' says Leslie, 'I find it quoted in a book of Roger Williams's, called, "The Great Fox dug out of his Burrow."'

Of Humphry Norton there is but one book extant, or mentioned by John Whiting, in his catalogue of Friends books, printed 1708. It relates, I think, wholly to New-England, and was printed in 1659. I have searched in vain for this letter and its attestation. It must be noted that Williams' book was printed in New-England, and as it may be said that Whiting suppressed some other books of Norton's, from his catalogue, I would add that Whiting does insert unapproved publications, and that Leslie has not given the title of Norton's book, which he says he saw in manuscript, and which Williams is said to quote. For Williams, I have also searched in vain; though Friends' library has a part of a copy, containing not more than the title and some introduction. Such then are the grounds on which Leslie would have us believe that George Fox wrote such a letter: and whether it be likely that he, a writer even of this century, ever saw a Quaker-manuscript of the time of Cromwell, which was afterwards printed, let the reader judge.

It may now be seasonable to mention the occasion on which, in 1654, Fox did write a letter of some kind to the protector. We shall then have his own, and Leslie's account of the affair, before us, and may judge of the probability of its containing

blasphemy: and I trust that even if it should be concluded that he did write exactly as Leslie says he did (which is not granted) that he might do so, and not blaspheme. If the letter be a forgery, the charge falls; and even if it be genuine, I think it may be shown, from Fox's stile on other occasions, that the sense which Leslie, and, after him, our Encyclopædists, have given to it, is not necessarily to be inferred from the words which they quote.

I believe it is not disputed by any one, that the occasion of George Fox's writing to Cromwell, was to satisfy him that he was not a person likely to oppose his government, by taking up arms. Fox had been apprehended at Whetstone in Leicestershire, as he was about to go to a meeting, on account, as it should seem, of the report of a plot against Cromwell.* Being apprehended, he was examined by colonel Hacker, who took some pains to persuade him to stay at home, and not to hold meetings. On his refusing to engage to do so, Hacker sent him to the protector by captain Drury. Drury also on the way endeavoured to prevail on him to remain at home. All however being ineffectual, he was brought to an inn at Charing Cross, where Drury informed him that the protector required him to promise, 'not to take up a carnal sword or weapon against him, or the government as it then was,' and that he should write it in his own terms, and sign it. The words of George Fox's journal are these: (Edit. 1. p. 137.) 'I said little in reply to captain Drury, but the next morning I was moved of the Lord to write a paper to the protector, by the name of Oliver Cromwell, wherein I did, in the presence of the Lord, declare, that I did deny the wearing or drawing of a carnal

* This circumstance is mentioned under the head, *Formey*.

‘ sword, or any other outward weapon against him,
 ‘ or any man. And that I was sent of God to stand
 ‘ a witness against all violence, and against the works
 ‘ of darkness, and to turn people from the darkness
 ‘ to the light, and to bring them from the occasion
 ‘ of war and fighting, to the peaceable gospel; and
 ‘ from being evil-doers, which the magistrate’s sword
 ‘ should be a terror to. When I had written what
 ‘ the Lord had given me to write, I set my name
 ‘ to it, and gave it to captain Drury, to give to
 ‘ O. Cromwell, which he did.’ It follows, in Fox’s
 journal, that Cromwell, on receiving the letter,
 sent for him, spent some time with him in friendly
 discourse, and not only gave him liberty, but di-
 rected that he should dine at Whitehall. This has
 no appearance of the protector’s thinking that Fox
 had used blasphemous expressions.

The Encyclopædists, in a note, say, ‘ That Mr.
 ‘ Leslie’s copy is authentic, is thus attested by two
 ‘ of the friends who saw Fox deliver it to the
 ‘ protector’s messenger. “ We are witnesses to this
 “ testimony, whose names in the flesh are, Thomas
 “ Aldam, Robert Craven.” How these names,
 which subsist as attestations only in Leslie’s book, or
 which at most the editors only drew from thence,
 can authenticate this book, or any part of it, is to
 me a paradox; but I mention it for the sake of
 comparing it with what Fox says in his journal,
 p. 140. ‘ T. Aldam and R. Craven (who had
 ‘ been sheriff of Lincoln), and divers friends,
 ‘ came up to London after me; but A. Parker abode
 ‘ with me.’ It is to be sure possible that Aldam and
 Craven might come, time enough to see him give
 his paper to Drury; but as it appears to have
 been delivered before the early dinner hour of
 those days, on the morrow of his arrival, it does
 not seem probable that they had arrived in time.

By this time the reader may have formed a judgment whether Fox did really believe himself the Son of God or not; that is, whether he believed himself to be Jesus of Nazareth; for in order to convict him of the blasphemy for which he is indicted by Lesslie, we must believe that this was his clear apprehension: and as it is too absurd to be supposed of a man who constantly mentions Christ in the third person, I believe we must acquit him. At the same time it must be acknowledged that the inaccuracy of his stile may occasion his meaning to be misunderstood; for if we construe his writings, or possibly those of his time, by the strict rules of grammar, we shall certainly fail in the discovery of their import. Fox was a man rapid in thought, and often seemed to insert an idea just as it occurred, without observing its reference, or connection with his context. The following are a few instances, 'And we say that Christ is come, a priesthood after the order of Melchisedech, the similitude and likeness, *who* ends the similitude and 'likeness.' (a) The relative, say our grammars, refers to the nearest antecedent, which is Melchisedech; but George Fox, who probably knew nothing of relative and antecedent, certainly meant that Christ was the end of similitudes. Again, speaking to the priests, 'Ye have had a shop *that* inwardly 'ravened;' (b) that is, ye, that inwardly ravened, have had a shop. To raven, seems to have been a verb understood by Fox and his opponents, meaning greedy desire and departure from the feeding of Christ. Again, 'This (i. e. the light) lets us 'see the Scriptures in their place, and the fulfilling 'of them, *which* was given forth to be believed, 'practised, read, and fulfilled.' (c) Here both the

* Great Mystery, p. 69. * Ib. 70. * Ib. 70.

relative *which*, and the verb singular *was*, according to strict construction, refer to *fulfilling*; but G. Fox meant *the Scriptures*. Once more, from the same book, 'God breathed into man the breath of life, and he became a living soul, *who* hath all souls in his hand, and the soul is immortal, and Christ the bishop of it is immortal, and God hath it in his hand which goeth against him that doth evil, *whose* hand is immortal.' (d) This, according to Lesliean construction, would denote that man hath all souls in his hand, and that the hand of the evil doer is immortal. I will mention a passage from another of his books, viz. Saul's Errand to Damascus, p. 5. 'And where the works of God are now, they think them strange things now, as was then, who are alive in the flesh.' Take one example more from his mouth, spoken on his trial at Lancaster. 'It is God and Christ that sanctifieth; and the saints are all one in the Father and the Son, they are of his bone and of his flesh, Ephes. v. 30. And the Father and the Son are one, and *they* are the sons of God.' According to grammar, the latter *they* refers to the words *Father* and *Son*, which would make nonsense. It may be observed, that George Fox had been charged with saying that he was equal with God; but on this examination he was discharged. Here then we have Fox's stile; and by it let us examine the letter in question, pretended or authentic. 'I am moved to give this forth for the truth's sake, from him whom the world calls G. Fox, who is the son of God,' &c. Let *who* refer to him *truth*; and all is orthodox, according to John xiv. 6. "I am the way, the truth, and the life." And if any will still object that the following member 'who is sent to stand a witness,'

^d Great Mystery, p. 327.

which in the Journal is confessed to relate to Fox, proves that the preceding one doth also; the foregoing quotation from Saul's Errand to Damascus, will show this not to be a necessary consequence; and also show the alternate, though certainly inconspicuous, manner, in which Fox arranged his ideas.

SECTION VIII.

WESLEY.

IN the year 1782 was published a concise ecclesiastical history, from the birth of Christ to the beginning of the present century (the 18th); without an author's name, but universally attributed to the celebrated John Wesley; and sold, as the title imports, 'at the Rev. Mr. Wesley's preaching-houses in town and country.' In this, of course, is a history of the Quakers. No man could be more conveniently situated for obtaining authentic information respecting them than John Wesley. He then lived in London, so far as his plan of itinerancy permits us to call any place his abode; and as the metropolis contains so large a number of the people which he was about to describe, it would have been natural and easy for him to have made application to some of them, for reference to such documents as might furnish him with the best materials for his history: reserving still to himself the privilege of putting his own construction on the information which he might obtain. Yet he does not appear to have taken any step of this kind; but to have contented himself with retailing the page of Mosheim.

There is therefore scarcely any thing mentioned by Wesley, to which the remarks I have made on the corresponding place of Mosheim are not applicable. In general, the very words of Maclaine's translation are used. On one of these words, as we go along, I will make a short remark. In 1647, George Fox, it is said, began to *stroll* through

several counties in England.' (Vol. 4, p. 128.) Without staying long to inquire whether *to stroll* be a good translation of the Latin word *percurro**, used by Mosheim, it seems an unhappy term for Wesley to have given, to the practice of travelling for the purpose of religious instruction. Accordingly we do not find him using it in the description of his own long, painful, and I am willing to add, useful, travels in the work of awakening sinners.

Although, the source of Wesley's information being thus shown, it may be the less needful to say much, by way of animadversion, on his account; yet one passage, forming a note in Mosheim, but transferred to his text by Wesley, may claim our examination; particularly as it relates to a work much esteemed, not by the Quakers only, but, I believe, by the public in general, or by that part of it which pays attention to theological writings. The reader may easily guess I am speaking of Barclay's Apology. The credit of this book, it is attempted to invalidate, by observing that Barclay 'has interpreted and modified the opinions of his sect after the manner of an advocate, who undertakes the defence of a bad cause.' 'In the first place, he observes an intire silence in relation to those fundamental principles of Christianity, concerning which it is of great consequence to know the real opinions of the Quakers; and thus exhibits a system of theology, that is evidently lame and imperfect.'† What those fundamental points are, we are not informed by either of the learned historians. Let us then examine for ourselves whether Barclay doth not clearly set forth the foundation of Christianity, or whether his system be lame and defective. In

* Angliæ quasdam provincias percurrerat.

† Wesley, Vol. IV. p. 135; and Mosheim's Tr. 8vo. 1768. p. 36, note.

doing this, let us bear in mind the nature of his Apology. It is not an apology for tenets which all Christians hold in common. These want no apology. But its intent is to show the consistency of our Friends' peculiar tenets with the Gospel; the harmony of their structure, with the foundation, and corner stone, on which they profess to build.

The First Proposition of Barclay, being short, I shall transcribe it, and then let the reader judge of his deficiency in displaying the foundation of the Christian religion.

Prop. I. 'Seeing the height of all happiness
' is placed in the true knowledge of God (this
' is life eternal, to know Thee the only true God,
' and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent), the true
' and right understanding of this foundation and
' ground of knowledge, is that which is most neces-
' sary to be known and believed in the first place.'

The generality of the professors of Christianity maintain that this knowledge is to be obtained from the Scriptures; but the Quakers, by Immediate Revelation: accordingly Barclay, with perfect consistency, as a skilful advocate, desirous of leading his reader the shortest and simplest road to the principle he wanted to recommend, makes Immediate Revelation the subject of his Second Thesis.

Prop. II. 'Seeing no man,' says Barclay, quoting Christ himself, 'knoweth the Father but the Son,
' and he to whom the Son revealeth him; and
' seeing the revelation of the Son is in and by the
' Spirit; therefore the testimony of the Spirit is
' that alone, by which the true knowledge of God
' hath been, is, and can be, only revealed,' &c.
This is a longer Proposition: I therefore forbear to transcribe the whole.

It is now natural for the mere scripturian to ask, In what estimation doth this people hold the Bible? Barclay anticipates the inquiry, and in his Third Thesis treats of Scripture. 'From these revelations of the Spirit of God to the saints, have proceeded,' says he, 'the Scriptures of truth;' of which he summarily describes the contents; and adds, 'Nevertheless they are only a declaration of the fountain, and not the fountain itself; therefore they are not to be esteemed the principal ground of all truth and knowledge;' with more to the same effect. Had Barclay stopped here, it is not clear to me that he would have formed a lame system; but he goes on, and launches out into other disquisitions: treating in his Fourth Thesis of the Condition of Man in the Fall. The subject of the Fifth and Sixth, is the Universal Redemption by Christ, and the Saving and Spiritual Light wherewith every Man is enlightened. In these the Doctrine of Reprobation is transiently, though ably, arraigned. Justification employs the Seventh, and Perfection the Eighth. The Ninth treats of Perseverance, and the possibility of falling from Grace. Ministry, Worship, Baptism, and the Communion, take up the Tenth, Eleventh, Twelfth, and Thirteenth; and the remaining two speak of Civil Conduct.

With this brief outline of the Apology (or rather of the Theses, of which it is a defence) in our view, let us proceed with our historians. It is observable,' say they, 'in the second place, that Barclay touches in a slight, superficial, and hasty manner, some tenets, which, when amply explained, had exposed the Quakers to censure.' Here again we are left in the dark with respect to the tenets alluded to; and must therefore endeavour to discover for ourselves what had been so obnoxious to

reproach. We know that their exalting the office of the inward light, and their making of the sacred writings only a subordinate rule, have occasioned their enemies to say that they denied the Scriptures. We know also that their disuse of Baptism with water, and of bread and wine in communion, have caused it to be said that they denied the ordinances of God: and that whatever share their uncomplimentary manners had in offending the pride and self-love of their neighbours, those three points have laid them the most open of any to censure. Nevertheless to each of those points, Robert Barclay has allotted a separate Thesis, and its corresponding explanation, defence, and proof. ‘Lastly,’ says Wesley, continuing to use the words of Mosheim, ‘he employs the greatest dexterity and art in softening and modifying those invidious doctrines, which he cannot conceal; for which purpose he avoids all those phrases that are made use of by the Quakers, and are peculiar to their sect, and expresses their tenets in ordinary language, in terms of a vague and indefinite nature, and in a style that casts a sort of mask over their natural aspect. At this rate, the most enormous errors may be held with impunity; for there is no doctrine however absurd, to which a plausible air may not be given, by following the insidious method of Barclay.’

This is indeed a singular charge; yet some of its extraordinary inconsistency might indeed disappear, could it be proved that the terms of Barclay were vague and indefinite. On the contrary, his terms, by which I suppose it to be understood the words which he uses, are, I think it will be allowed, as simple, clear, and definite, as those of any author: and he has this advantage

above others, that as he wrote his Apology in Latin and English, each text is to be considered as an original; and each is an undeniable comment on the other; and may serve for the clearing up of any ambiguity that may unintentionally be in the work.* A few unusual words occur, which I have apprehended to be either Scotticisms, terms current in theology in the last century, or terms framed by the author to suit his own purpose; but these are generally of obvious meaning.

The terms of Barclay being, then, cleared from the imputation of ambiguity, it seems strange to say, that, because he wrote in ordinary language, his method is insidious; and that his style casts a veil over the natural aspect of the Quakers' tenets. In fact, Barclay rather removed the veil, which many of the phrases used by the earlier writers had cast over the aspect of the truths which they held. Many of them were men who had never conversed much with the learned world; and their style was of consequence unformed. After their conversion to Quakerism, they chiefly conversed with one another, and terms expressive of their feelings naturally sprung up, and became current among them, which a more intimate acquaintance with the powers of language might have shown to be as unnecessary, as they were obscure to common readers. The complexion, too, of the times admitted, and even favoured, on religious subjects, a sort of language, which is not now thought to be useful or pertinent. But Barclay, by his better acquaintance with language in general, with other languages than his vernacular one, and with the

* I take this opportunity of noticing an error of the press, which runs through several Editions of Barclay's Apology. Proposition viii. § 2. division 4—'Good and holy men who have *not* arrived to everlasting life.' Omit the word, *not*. Latin, 'Qui vitam eternam adepti sunt.'

manners of men of other countries, had not contracted the peculiarities of a more confined education; and therefore explained the principles of our friends in a way that exposed them in some degree of their genuine beauty, unobscured by vulgarisms, incorrectness, and terms of partial acceptance.*

There is extant a letter written, in 1746-7, to a person lately joined with the people called Quakers, which is attributed to Wesley, in which the author examines the opinions of that body, as set forth by Barclay. He subdivides some of the propositions, so as to extract from the fifteen, twenty-six articles, to thirteen of which he agrees. On the subject of Justification, a topic on which J. Wesley seems to have thought himself particularly enlightened, Barclay is quoted as follows: ‘As
 ‘ many as receive the light, in them is produced a
 ‘ holy and spiritual birth, bringing forth holiness,
 ‘ righteousness, purity, and all other blessed fruits.
 ‘ By which holy birth, as we are sanctified, so are
 ‘ we justified.’ The letter writer goes on. ‘Here
 ‘ is a wide difference between Quakerism and
 ‘ Christianity. This is flat justification by works.
 ‘ Whereas the Christian doctrine is, that we are
 ‘ justified by faith: that unto him that worketh not,
 ‘ but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly,
 ‘ his faith is counted to him for righteousness.
 ‘ The ground of this mistake is the not understanding
 ‘ the meaning of the word Justification. For Robert

* What I have said here may be thought inconsistent with that well known tenet of our Society, which denies human learning to be necessary for Gospel Ministry. I however acknowledge the tenet in its fullest extent; believing that the same Power which can make the dumb to speak, can also make the ignorant and unlearned to be as the pen of a ready writer. But seeing written language wants the accent, emphasis, tone, and gesture, by which the meaning of vocal language is much conveyed, a proper choice and arrangement of words is more essential to the former than to the latter.

‘ Barclay takes it in the same sense as the Papists do,
 ‘ confounding it with Sanctification. So in the
 ‘ 208th page of his Apology, he says in express
 ‘ terms, Justification, taken in its proper signification,
 ‘ is Making just, and is all one with Sanctification.’

It might here be asked whether the receiving of the light be not faith. If it be, this is not ‘ Flat justification by works.’ But by reciting the whole of this Thesis of Barclay, which is a short one, we shall further see that such a charge was premature, and we may also be tempted to believe that the letter writer, short as it is, had not read it through.

Prop. VII. ‘ As many as resist not this light,
 ‘ but receive the same, it becomes in them an
 ‘ holy, pure, and spiritual birth, bringing forth
 ‘ holiness, righteousness, purity, and all those
 ‘ other blessed fruits which are acceptable to
 ‘ God: by which holy birth, to wit, Jesus Christ
 ‘ formed within us, and working his works in
 ‘ us, as we are sanctified, so are we justified in the
 ‘ sight of God, according to the apostle’s words,
 “ But ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but
 “ ye are justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus,
 “ and by the Spirit of our God.” 1 Cor. vi. 11,
 ‘ Therefore it is not by our works, wrought in
 ‘ our will, nor yet by good works, considered as
 ‘ of themselves; but by Christ, who is both the
 ‘ gift and the giver, and the cause producing the
 ‘ effect in us; who as he hath reconciled us
 ‘ while we were enemies, doth also in his wisdom
 ‘ save us and justify us after this manner: as
 ‘ saith the same apostle elsewhere, “ According
 “ to his mercy he saved us, by the washing
 “ of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy
 “ Ghost.” Can this be called Flat justification
 by works?

It is not the object of these researches to examine doctrines; but to show that all who have undertaken to examine ours, have not let us fairly speak our own language; and that from a mutilated quotation a false conclusion is drawn; otherwise it may be suspected that not only the opinion of this letter writer, concerning Barclay's view of justification is erroneous; but that his own view of the subject, and that more openly carrying the stamp of Wesley,* is liable to dispute. But I forbear. My desire is that no one who desires to be acquainted with our doctrines, may take them on trust from any beside ourselves: then let them receive a currency according to their intrinsic value.

Since I wrote what precedes, I have perused a small pamphlet published in 1778, intitled, 'Reasons for quitting the Methodist Society, being a defence of Barclay's Apology, in answer to a

* Wesley's first view of the subject of Justification, which he appears to have gained from his intercourse with the Moravians, seems to have been that it consisted in a sudden inward sense of pardon for past sins, together with a lively faith, which tended to good works, and preserved from evil. The many wonderful instances of persons suddenly falling down and bewailing their sins, under the ministry of the early Methodists, and afterwards as suddenly declaring they had found reconciliation, are adduced as examples of justification by faith. Barclay's more simple explanation of the word, Justification, *Being made just*, he seems to reject. It is probable, however, from an abstract of the minutes of conference, which I find in Whitehead's Life of Wesley, Vol. II. p. 315 to 344, that the opinions of the latter had been somewhat changed on this point. To the question, 'We said in 1744, we have leaned too much toward Calvinism. Wherein?'—One answer, among many, is, 'We have received it as a maxim that a man is to do nothing, in order to Justification. Nothing can be more false. Whoever desires to find favour with God, should cease to do evil, and learn to do well. So God himself teaches by the prophet Isaiah. Whoever repents should do works meet for repentance. And if this is not in order to find favour, what does he do them for?' Again, 'Does not talking, without the proper caution of a justified or sanctified state, tend to mislead men; almost naturally leading them to trust to what was done in one moment? Whereas we are every moment pleasing or displeasing to God, according to our works; according to the whole of our present inward tempers, and outward behaviour.' It is candid, in a religious Society, thus openly to avow its errors; and does credit to the Methodist conference of 1770.

‘printed letter to a person joined with the people ‘called Quakers,’ by John Helton. It appears from this, that Wesley was the undoubted author of the letter in question; and that it was considered in 1778, among the Methodists, as a notable preservative against Quakerism: to which J. Helton, from being one of J. Wesley’s approved preachers, had lately become a convert. This tract is a well adapted answer to the doctrinal part of Wesley’s letter (for such I shall now call it) and contains another instance of his unfair method of quoting R. Barclay, (p. 6 and 7) respecting the subject, Scriptures. In that part of his letter where he treats on Baptism, he seems to use the same liberty; and as what he says is short, I shall transcribe the whole; and shall add in an opposite column the real words of Barclay, that the reader may judge how far his consequence can be drawn from them.

XII. “As there is one Lord and one faith, so “there is one baptism,” ‘Yea, one outward baptism, which you deny. Here therefore is another ‘difference between Quakerism and Christianity.’”

‘But “if those <i>whom</i>	“If those <i>that were</i>
“ <i>John</i> baptized with	“baptized with water,
“water, were not bap-	“were not,” &c.
“tized with the baptism	
“of Christ; then the	
“baptism of water is not	
“the baptism of Christ.”	

‘This is a mere quibble. The sequel ought to be, Then that baptism of water (i. e. John’s baptism) was not the baptism of Christ, Who

* The words of Wesley are distinguished by single commas; those of Barclay, whether rightly quoted or not, by double ones.

' says it was? Yet Robert Barclay is so fond of this
' argument, that he repeats it in almost the same
' words.

" If <i>John</i> who admi- " nistered the baptism " of water, yet did not " baptize with the bap- " tism of Christ; then " the baptism of water " is not the baptism of " Christ."	" If he who really " and truly administered " the baptism of water, " did, notwithstanding, " declare that he neither " could nor did baptize " with the baptism of " Christ; then," &c.
---	---

' This is the same fallacy still. The sequel here
' also should be " Then *that* baptism of water was
' not the baptism of Christ."

' He repeats it, with a little variation, the third
' time.'

" Christ himself saith, " John baptized with " water, but ye shall be " baptized with the Ho- " ly Ghost."	" Christ himself saith, " John <i>truly</i> baptized " with water, but," &c.
---	---

It may here be remarked, that Barclay builds an
argument on the word, truly, omitted by Wesley.
" John truly baptized with water, which is as
" much as if he had said, John did truly and fully
" administer the baptism of water, but ye shall be
" baptized with, &c. This sheweth that they
" were to be baptized with some other baptism,
" than the baptism of water; and that although
" they were formerly baptized with the baptism of
" water, yet not with that of Christ, which they
" were to be baptized with." Apol. p. 417.
Edit. 6th, 7th, or 8th.

Wesley goes on ' He repeats it a fourth time.

“Peter saith, Then
 “remembered I the
 “word of the Lord,
 “John baptized with
 “water, but ye shall be
 “baptized with the Ho-
 “ly Ghost. From all
 “which it follows, that
 “such as John baptized
 “with water, yet were
 “not baptized with the
 “baptism of Christ.”

“Then remembered
 “I the word of the
 “Lord, John *indeed*
 “baptized with water,
 “but ye shall be bap-
 “tized with the Holy
 “Ghost”—“From all
 “which *three sentences,*
 “*relative one to another,*
 “*first of John, secondly*
 “*of Christ, and thirdly*
 “*of Peter,* it doth evi-
 “dently follow that such
 “as *were truly and really*
 “*baptized with the bap-*
 “*tism of water,* were not-
 “withstanding not bap-
 “tized with the baptism
 “of the Spirit, which is
 “that of Christ.” Ibid.

‘Very true’ adds Wesley to his mutilated cita-
 tion, ‘But this proves neither more nor less than
 ‘that the baptism of John differed from the bap-
 ‘tism of Christ. And so doubtless it did: not
 ‘indeed as to the outward sign, but as to the in-
 ‘ward grace.’ Assumption, without proof!

Here, although Wesley had said before, There
 is but one outward baptism, he allows of two; and
 here he lets go the subject, in a manner which I
 think can afford little satisfaction to such as choose
 to examine this part of Barclay for themselves.
 For Barclay, winding up his proof, taken from the
 before-mentioned words of John, Christ, and
 Peter, and showing, as I have just quoted, that
 such as were truly baptized with water, were not-
 withstanding not baptized with the baptism of

Christ, thus continues, " And such as truly and
 " really did administer the baptism of water, did,
 " in so doing, not administer the baptism of Christ.
 " So that if there be now but one baptism, as we
 " have already proved, we may safely conclude it
 " is, that of the Spirit, and not of water ; else it
 " would follow that the one baptism, which now
 " continues, were the baptism of water, i. e.
 " John's Baptism, and not the baptism of the
 " Spirit, i. e. Christ's : which were most absurd."

But, I repeat it, doctrine is not my immediate object. For the subject of baptism in general I refer to Barclay ; and for the doctrine of Wesley's letter, to his, I think, candid examiner, Helton.

I have no desire by these remarks to detract from any part of the just reputation of John Wesley, whom I believe to have been the instrument of good to thousands ; and whose memory, as it is preserved in the various accounts of his life, I respect and love. It was natural for him to rejoice in the increase of the numerous society which sprung up under his ministry ; but while he was thus so far satisfied, at seeing the desire of his soul, it was also natural for him to lament when his adherents forsook him ; and several did forsake the Methodist society, to join with that of our Friends. That he should therefore regard with no favourable eye a body which was sometimes receiving recruits, by secessions from his own, is by no means surprising ; and having thus acquired rather a dislike to the Quakers, as infringers on his province, than a love, as fellow helpers in the promotion of holiness, he was not prepared, when, in preparing his Concise Ecclesiastical History, he came to Mosheim's misrepresentations of that people ; he was not, I say, prepared, to wish them to be untrue ;

and consequently not to take pains in inquiring whether they were so. It should also be remembered that at the time he published his Concise History, he was about seventy-eight years of age; a time in which minute and severe investigation of literary subjects is hardly to be expected; and, if a stranger to him may judge, he was probably at that time engaged in the frequent and assiduous exercise of his ministry, as well as in much travelling from place to place: for even after this I find him in Holland, when he was about eighty, and again when he was about eighty-three. These avocations were scarcely compatible with the describer of the events of the church from the birth of Christ to the present time: but Wesley's good-will to the cause, his yet enterprising mind, and, it is possible, the general deference of his friends to his judgment, prevented him from discerning it, and from suspecting himself no longer equal to the task which he had undertaken.

THE
L I F E

OF

JAMES NAYLER,

WHEREIN IT IS ATTEMPTED TO INCLUDE

MORE PARTICULARS RESPECTING HIM,

Than are to be found in any one Account Extant.

INTERSPERSED WITH

REFLECTIONS

ARISING FROM THE SUBJECT.

THE JOURNAL OF THE
LIFE OF

JAMES NAYLER

AS A
WITNESS

TO THE
TRUTH

OF THE
GOSPEL

OF THE
NEW TESTAMENT

IN THE
LIFE OF

THE
SACRED

SCRIPTURES

AND
THE

TRUTH

THE LIFE of JAMES NAYLER, &c.

I HAVE thought it might be useful, even at this length of time from the sufferings of James Nayler, to give some more complete view of his life than yet has been done. He is still cited, as an irrefutable proof of the supposed danger of adopting principles in religion, such as those which the Quakers profess to hold. This was probably what the parliament of 1656 would have desired, if not what they intended by their cruel sentence; and as in this respect they imitated their high-church predecessors, in the use of the scourge, the mutilating knife, and the dungeon; so at present, men who profess to abhor the principles of the long parliament, still join with it in that disposition which led to such rigorous conduct; namely, a desire to villify the body of which Nayler was a conspicuous member. It is certainly difficult to appreciate the motives of men; and in this instance, time, which often assists in their developement, has not brought any facts to light which were not known at the period of which I am about to treat. But when, as I have elsewhere remarked, we perceive the parliament of 1656, scarcely sparing the life of Nayler (for a motion was made that his punishment should be death), and inflicting on him pains that would not have been uncongenial to the

times of a Nero or a Dioclesian; at the same time that the other actors in the business for which he was punished, were even not arraigned; it is natural to conclude that the purpose of the severity then, like that of the obloquy cast on the memory of Nayler now, was to render odious the principles of the Quakers.

I therefore wish, if the memory of James Nayler may not rest peaceably, with the people who are not ashamed to have had him among the number of their early adherents, that the public may see the whole man, and not estimate the tenor of his life from a moment of disease. That he fell is not denied, but that he rose from his fall is equally true; and it shows that either he possessed principles which, in the hours of his retreat, were sufficient to discover to him his errors, or that he acquired them in his humiliation. We are not informed that he was otherwise after his restoration, than he had been previous to his downfall, that is, an approved Quaker; therefore to the due and right application of the doctrine which that Society teaches, it is at least as fair to attribute his recovery as his fall.

We have not much account of Nayler before he became a Friend. His occupation of a soldier would not give such scope for the exercise of those talents, which his enemies allow him to have possessed, as that of a public speaker; for he is said to have been an eloquent man. This probably was not much more than a natural eloquence, assisted with the very moderate learning which, in those days, a husbandman might be supposed to give to his son. The place of his birth was Ardsley, a village in Yorkshire. His father is said to have possessed an estate sufficient, with industry, for the

purpose of a comfortable subsistence. James was born in 1618, and on his marriage, about 1640, removed to Wakefield; but the civil war breaking out the following year, he became a soldier in the army of Fairfax, and afterwards a quarter-master under Lambert. Sicknefs, however, disabled him, and detached him from his military employ; and he returned to Wakefield, after having been about eight years in the army. During this time his religious profession was among the Independents.

George Fox was now fully entered on his public preaching; and came in the year 1651 to Wakefield, where James Nayler dwelled. Nayler appears readily to have found in his own mind a consent to the doctrine which Fox believed himself called to promulgate; and as Fox informs us in his *Journal*, not that Nayler was convinced at a meeting, but that he came to him and was convinced, it is probable, that he had sought the company of Fox; in order to discover if the doctrine of the latter could satisfy the want, which every thoughtful and sincere man must find, from indecision on a matter so important, as that which concerns the future well-being of the soul. That many serious persons at this period, should be unsettled and undecided is no matter of surprize. England was then torn with intestine commotion on account of religion; and the professed followers of the Prince of Peace were either pretending to defend his cause by the sword, or were making that cause a colour for their own ambition. It was, and it long continued to be, a time of violence and extremes: and if any of the primitive Quakers partook in any degree of the temper of the times; and were in a greater or less proportion, shaken from the centre of immutable truth; those surely who do not, with

them, allow the notion of a spiritual inward direction of the conduct, should be the foremost to palliate that to which man by nature is so evidently prone.

Nayler appears to have been from his youth* a person attentive to religion, and the year ensuing that of his conviction, he believed himself bound in religious duty to quit his family, and travel, as the way might, from time to time, be opened in his mind. He declares himself to have received this commission, while he was meditating on the things of God, in the field at plough; that he then heard a voice, bidding him go out from his kindred and from his father's house, with a promise that the Lord would be with him. He says that he exceedingly rejoiced to hear the voice of the Lord, whom he had professed from a child, and had endeavoured to serve; and made some preparation for his journey; that he afterwards however was disobedient to this voice, on which account he declares the wrath of God was upon him, so that he appeared in danger of losing his life; till at length, going a little way from home with a friend, not then thinking of a journey, and unprovided for one, he was commanded to go into the west. What was the purpose of his mission he knew not; but on his arrival it was given him what to declare; and thus he continued, not knowing one day what he was to do on the morrow. It does not appear clearly whether this journey was to the west of England, or only westward of his habitation, Wakefield. The latter is most pro-

* The Committee of Parliament, however, accuse him of blasphemy, and what it terms, 'Uncivil and wanton carriage with a married woman.' The latter article is swelled into adultery, by one Deacon, who wrote two pamphlets against Nayler, about the time of his sentence. This Deacon and Nayler had been opponents in writing.

bable, for in the year 1652 we find him suffering much personal abuse at Walney Island, in Lancashire, disputing with priests in Westmoreland; and finally, in the Eleventh month of that year, indicted at the quarter sessions at Appleby, for what was termed blasphemy: that is, according to the indictment, for having said that Christ was in him, and there was but one word of God. On this occasion it appears that divers of the commonwealth preachers either had been the promoters of the arrest, or accusers on the trial. It turned much on the circumstance of Nayler's asserting Christ to be in him; but concluded without convicting him of the blasphemy for which he had been indicted. Nevertheless the justices ordered him to be kept in prison, until certain petitions should be answered, which had been preferred against him, George Fox, Francis Howgil, and others. By this must have been meant answers by the prisoners to the allegations of the petitioners. James Nayler remained about twenty weeks in prison, during which time he published, jointly with George Fox, a pamphlet, intitled, 'Several Petitions answered, that were 'put up by the Priests of Westmoreland,' &c. It is singular, if this piece procured his liberty, seeing it abounds with censure, not very gently expressed, against the petitioning priests. There is in it, among other things, a paper signed Jervis Benson, who had been one of the magistrates on the bench at Appleby, whereby it appears that, although it was alleged (another account says, by Benson himself,) that the words spoken by Nayler, were not within the act against blasphemy, nor against any law; two other magistrates had declared themselves willing to risque the being fined at the assizes, rather than that he should have his liberty; also

that justice Pearson told his colleague Benson, the subscriber of the paper, that he must give an account of their proceedings to the ministers and others. So priest-ridden, if this paper be genuine, was a quarter-sessions in 1652.

It will not be foreign to the business of illustrating the long defamed character of Nayler, to observe that Pearson, although not appearing friendly to him, received on this occasion such impressions in favour of the principles held by Friends, that he afterwards joined them, and became himself an open and able advocate for them in writing; and this in a work not written from the impulse (as it is called) of the moment, and without study, or consultation of writers, but evincing a mind which had well weighed the subject, and was well versed in it.*

The same year that Nayler was released from Appleby gaol, if not during his confinement in it, we find him also writing a paper, entitled, 'Truth cleared from Scandal, being James Nayler's Answer and Declaration touching some things charged upon him in the Lancashire Petition.† It seems by this, that the ministers in Lancashire had also been alarmed at his doctrine; and when we consider he was one of the early declaimers against forced maintenance, it is not wonderful that they should be. A doctrine, at all times disagreeable to the lucrative teacher, had then also the appearance of innovation; and when the sup-

* The great state of Tythes, truly stated, clearly opened, and fully resolved, by Anthony Pearson; formerly a justice of the peace in Westmoreland.

† This was a petition to the council of state against Fox and Nayler. It was likewise answered by them jointly, in a book called *Saul's Errand to Damascus, with his Packet of Letters from the High Priests against the Disciples of the Lord.*

port of preconceived and gainful opinions, and not truth, is the object of solicitude, Innovation is an alarming word. It might not, however, have been necessary to mention this paper, on account of the persons to whom it was an answer; but as it contains James Nayler's belief concerning Christ, it is material to be noticed; because the outcry that was, a few years after, raised against him, was on the pretence of great error on this point of faith.

Concerning Jesus Christ, (says Nayler) who is the eternal Word of God, by whom all things were made and are upholden, who was before all time, but manifested in time for the recovery of lost man, which word became flesh, and dwelt among the saints, who is the same yesterday, and to day, and for ever; who did and doth dwell in the saints; who suffered and rose again, and ascended into heaven, and is set on the right hand of God; to whom all power is given, in heaven and in earth; who filleth all places; he is the light of the world; but known to none but those who receive and follow him; and those he leads up to God, out of all the ways, works, and worship of the world; by his pure light in them, whereby he reveals the man of sin, and by his power casts him out, and so prepares the bodies of the saints a fit temple for the pure God to dwell in, with whom dwells no unclean thing, And thus he reconciles God and man, and the image of God which in purity and holiness is renewed; and the image of Satan, which is all sin and uncleanness, is defaced. And none can witness redemption, further than Christ is thus revealed in them, to set them free from sin; which Christ I witness to be revealed in me in measure.

Gal. i. 16. 2 Cor. xiii. 5. Col. i. 27. The other

heads of the paper are, concerning the Scriptures, baptism, the resurrection, magistracy, and the ministry.

After the termination of his confinement, Nayler continued travelling in the service of the gospel in the north of England, and at length, in the year 1654, came to London. He declares himself to have entered into that city with the greatest fear that had ever been his experience on entering into any place: in spirit foreseeing that something would befall him in it; but not knowing what it should be.* It is with difficulty we trace his proceedings in London, and afterwards in the country, with accuracy. It is probable the Quakers were so much grieved with the occasion for reproach which he gave, that none of them thought fit to note occurrences which they probably wished to be forgotten. But they have been, and will be, remembered. Let us therefore endeavour to view them through as few false mediums as we can; and it will be found that the story is not less fraught with instruction, than the thing itself was with reproach: for, where is the man, be his natural qualifications, his acquirements, or his gifts, what they may, who can say he has no need of the caution? "Let him that thinketh that he standeth, take heed lest he fall."

It appears that Edward Burrough, and Francis Howgil (Nayler's fellow-prisoners at Appleby), had been the means of gathering a congregation of Friends in London, previously to the arrival of James Nayler. Much admiration, however, was excited in many of the hearers by the preaching

* This is in a small piece intitled, 'To the Life of God in All:' one of the papers in which he describes the means of his fall.

of the latter; so much indeed as to induce some inconsiderate women to undervalue Burrough and Howgil, and to disturb them in their ministry. This disorderly behaviour was reproved by the two ministers; but the women not being silenced, as it was hardly to be expected they would be, by the reprehension of persons whom they had taken upon them to judge, preferred, against Burrough and Howgil, their complaints to Nayler; and endeavoured to incense him against them. James did not appear forward to condemn his friends; but this effect of his well-founded fears increased the earnestness of his wild admirers; one of whom falling into a kind of passionate grief, exclaimed, in a shrill but mournful voice, ‘I looked for judgment; but, behold a cry.’ The piercing lamentations of this woman are considered as having had a great share in overturning the judgment of Nayler; and he became not only the dupe of her violent grief, and of that of her associates, but was also further led aside by their flattery: while, from his former intimates, the leading members of the Society of Friends, he was more and more estranged. For about this time were those letters written to him, in which he is said to have been addressed by the title of Everlasting Son of Righteousness, or that of Prince of Peace, only begotten Son of God, Fairest of ten thousand. That several persons should be found to concur in such impious adulation, is at first sight a matter of surprize; nevertheless, the page of ecclesiastical history has but too many instances of the extravagant effect of unbridled fancy, interfering in the province of religion: but, though these furnish matter of ridicule to the scoffer, and of exultation to the infidel, they in no wise shake the

confidence of the humble believer ; but enforce with emphasis, the injunction, " Watch."

Nayler allows this time to have been a time of darkness ; a darkness of which probably they can best, if not only, judge, who have witnessed a state of light. The worldly mind, which flights the idea of divine illumination, and which is contented with the twilight of mere human judgment, arising as it often does, from misconception, as it cannot comprehend the clearness of the light which the single eye receives, so neither can it fathom the darkness consequent on the close of that eye of faith, which hath been once opened in the soul. " If the light that is in you become darkness, how great is that darkness !" It therefore frequently condemns where it ought to pity, or at least it omits to add pity to its condemnation. Thus acted, I believe, those who contrived the punishment of James Nayler. It is remarkable that Nayler declared it to be his fear of opposing what might be right in his partisans, that prevented his opposing and reproving their extravagancies. Having lost his spirit of discernment, he was in a situation to accept almost any thing as truth, more especially that which was gratifying : and however his will had been concerned in the early part of his deviation, I am inclined to think that, in its progress, he did not intend evil ; but thought himself forbearing, in humility, to judge the actions of others ; and receiving their honour not as done to his person, but to that extraordinary manifestation of Christ which he continued to think he possessed. This opinion the sequel may establish or overthrow. Let us proceed with the narrative.

We are not clearly informed at what time of Nayler's residence in London the disturbances

which he occasioned begun. I apprehend not until 1656; for it is not likely a course so extravagant should have been long without a check. In 1655 and 1656, he appears to have published about sixteen pamphlets, several of them controversial; and some of them which were not so, being republished in the collection of his works, 1716, it seems to show that he had not, at the time of their being written, separated from the fellowship of the Friends. Nor indeed does it appear that he was ever forward to do so; for the next memorial we have of him, as it confirms my opinion of the date of his errors, proves his desire to retain his acquaintance with his friends. In the summer of 1656, George Fox was in prison at Launceston, and James Nayler, on his way to pay him a visit, was himself imprisoned at Exeter. With the exact cause of his being confined, and with the mode of his release, we are unacquainted; * but as it appears that his frantic companions were with him, it may be supposed it was owing to some disturbance which was raised. As other friends, however, on their way to see George Fox, were imprisoned at Exeter, this supposition is not conclusive; although G. Fox hints at a disturbance which Nayler had previously occasioned at Bristol. George Fox was released from Launceston on the 13th of the Seventh month (September) and after a short stay in Cornwall, was himself the visitor

* An anonymous account, published 1719, intitled, 'Memoirs of the Life, Ministry, Trials, and Sufferings, of James Nayler, the Quakers' great Apostle,' cites the committee of parliament, as mentioning in their Report, that he was committed as a vagrant, and released by order of council. The author denies the former, and says in a note, that Saunders gave him liberty to go on his journey; but that he was brought back about twenty miles, and committed by a judge, and fined twenty marks for not putting off his hat—N. B. The author of the Memoirs appears to be a violent admirer of Nayler, though probably not a Quaker.

at Exeter prison of those whose intention it had been to visit him, in his severe durance at Launceston. William Penn says of George Fox, that 'he was 'a discerner of other mens' spirits, and much a 'master of his own.' Fox, in his journal, declares his sense that Nayler and his company were wrong, and dates his deviation, which Fox calls his running out into imaginations, to a little time before his own release from prison. George Fox had a meeting with the prisoners, but Nayler did not remain with them while the meeting was held; and the following day George speaking to him (probably by way of advice) James, though he slighted his advice, offered to George a salutation, which the latter in his turn rejected: saying that since Nayler had turned against the power of God, he could not receive his show of kindness. George adds in the same paragraph of his journal, 'After some time he returned to truth again.' The sight of his return was, probably, then at a distance, for in this prison he suffered three of his female adherents to kneel before him and kiss his feet.

Being released from Exeter, he made his way towards Bristol, his flattering companions attending him. It is said, by an adversary, that garments were strewed in his way at Glastonbury and Wells; but it is allowed on all hands, that his entry into Bristol was in imitation of the manner of the entry of Christ into Jerusalem. A man went bare-headed before him, a woman led his horse, three others strewed their scarfs and handkerchiefs in the way, and the company sung, 'Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord God of hosts; Hosannah in the highest; holy, holy, holy, is the Lord God of Israel.' So extraordinary a procession and acclamation, could not fail of attracting the notice of the police of any

well regulated city ; but it afforded to the persecutors of the Quakers, an opportunity of colouring their general severity, which it was not likely they would miss. However, to the apprehending of James Nayler, and to the examining of him and of his companions, no valid objection can be made. It was required for the peace of society. That the subsequent steps were necessary, is much to be doubted.

One is led to think that the laws of England had at that time no provision for the punishing of such disturbances ; since the legislature took upon itself first to be the court of trial, and next the awarder of the nature and quantity of the penalty. If we allow that laws did exist, by which the offenders could have been punished, we must look for some other motive, which could induce the parliament to take the business into its own hands ; to deliberate on it from day to day, to the interruption of public concerns ; to conclude it at length with so much severity, and even to have meditated more. If we suppose it was the honour of the Christian religion which it had at heart, and the abhorrence of blasphemy which it felt, why then did it not pursue the companions of Nayler with equal severity ; from whose mouths proceeded the expressions which were termed blasphemous ; and whose hearts, hands, and knees, had been the means of erecting him into an object of worship ? For my part, I have long suspected the selection of the victim to have arisen from a desire to crush the rising society of Friends, in the person of a fallen brother. Nayler had been truly eminent and esteemed. The others owed their notoriety, only to the injurious part which they were acting towards him.

The house interfered the 30th of November, and

received the report of a committee the 5th of December; and, after twelve times taking up the business (at some of which however it was only to adjourn it), on the 16th they constructed their sentence, which was resolved in form the day following. Before however we recite it, a summary view of the proceedings will be proper.

The evidence appears to have been taken before the committee of parliament, and agreed to by the house. The facts, as to the kneelings, singing, strewing garments, and walking in procession, were proved, as well by other witnesses, as by the ready confession of the actors themselves; who rather gloried in their deeds, than attempted to deny them. Nayler also confessed the facts alleged, and expressed his belief that his companions were moved of the Lord to perform the part they had taken. One of the charges was, his having '*assumed* the name and the incommunicable attributes and titles of our blessed Saviour,' as "The Fairest of ten thousand; the Only begotten Son of God." The evidence for these were letters written to him by others. At one of his examinations, being asked whether he had reproved the persons who gave him such titles, he would not say that he had reproved them; and to the question, whether he owned or disclaimed them, he replied, 'If they had it from the Lord, what am I that I should judge it?' He also said, 'If attributed to the creature, then it is reprovable. If they did it to the Lord (whom he believed to be in him) then I dare not reprove it:' also that he looked upon it to be really to the true honour of Christ, or else he would utterly have denied it. During this time it is said to have been the practice of Nayler's companions, at his lodging, when under custody of the serjeant of the house, to sit on the

floor, or on their heels, or to kneel, singing their usual ejaculations of praise, while he was seated in a chair; but my anonymous annotator says, they did the same in his absence. It appears however that he was still clouded in mind, and far from that state of true and lively contrition, to which he afterwards attained. The following answer, which seemed to close his examination before the committee, will however show that he was not without some perception of the true and only object of religious honour. 'I do abhor that any of that honour which is due to God, should be given to me, as I am a creature; but it pleased the Lord to set me up as a sign of the coming of the righteous one; and what hath been done in my passing through the towns, I was commanded by the Lord to suffer such things to be done to the outward as a sign. I abhor any honour as a creature.'

The report of the committee having been received by the whole house on the 5th of December, the next day Nayler was had before the house, and ordered to kneel, which he refused; and several questions were asked of him, of which no record seems to have been kept. By the 8th, the parliament got so far as to resolve, 'That James Nayler, upon the whole matter of fact, is guilty of horrid blasphemy;' also, 'That James Nayler is a grand imposter and seducer of the people.' The house having passed these two resolves, the question came daily before it (the 14th excepted, which was the First day of the week), until the 16th, and two divisions took place, when a motion was made that the punishment should be death. This was lost by the majority of ninety-six to eighty-two, and, after much deliberation the same day, the next day the

punishment was resolved as follows. ‘ Resolved,
 ‘ That James Nayler be set on the pillory, with
 ‘ his head in the pillory, in the Palace Yard, West-
 ‘ minster, during the space of two hours, on Thursday
 ‘ next (i. e. the following day), and shall be whipped
 ‘ through the streets from Westminster to the Old
 ‘ Exchange (i. e. the top of Cheapside), London,
 ‘ and there likewise be set on the pillory, with
 ‘ his head in the pillory, for the space of two
 ‘ hours, on Saturday next; in each place wearing
 ‘ a paper, containing an inscription of his crimes;
 ‘ and that at the Old Exchange, his tongue be
 ‘ bored through with a hot iron, and that he be
 ‘ there also stigmatized in the forehead with the
 ‘ letter B, and that he be afterwards sent to Bristol,
 ‘ and be conveyed into and through the said city on
 ‘ horse-back, bare ridged, with his face backward,
 ‘ and there also publicly whipped, the next market
 ‘ day after he comes thither, and that from thence
 ‘ he be committed to prison in Bridewell, London,
 ‘ and there restrained from the society of all people,
 ‘ and there to labour hard till he shall be released
 ‘ by parliament, and during that time shall be de-
 ‘ barred the use of pen, ink, and paper, and shall
 ‘ have no relief but what he earns by his daily
 ‘ labours.’

Before the admission of Nayler to hear his sen-
 tence, it was moved that he should be asked whether
 he had any thing to say, why judgment should not
 be pronounced upon him; which was determined
 in the negative, by one hundred and seven to eighty-
 seven. On the speaker preparing to pronounce
 sentence, Nayler said he did not know his offence;
 to which the speaker (Widdrington) replied, ‘ that
 ‘ he should know his offence, by his punishment.’
 Although he was thus not permitted to speak, he
 is said, as he left the house, to have uttered these

words, 'He that hath prepared the body, will enable me to suffer; and I pray that he may not lay it to your charge.'

It is natural to inquire what, during all these proceedings, was the part of Oliver Cromwell, who was then at the head of the executive government, under the title of Protector. He appears thus far not to have interfered at all; and even the warrants to the several sheriffs, for the execution of the sentence, were issued by the speaker.

On the day appointed, Nayler suffered the first part of his sentence. He stood the allotted time in the pillory, and received, at a cart, in a course of nearly two miles, three hundred and ten stripes; after which he was left with his wounds undressed, for above an hour; when a woman, a person in esteem with the society of Friends, not one of his ranting companions, came and washed his stripes. It is therefore probable, that four hours must have elapsed from the time his head was fastened down, until the arrival of this relief. A treatment so severe would of course reduce his strength; and his sufferings operated so forcibly on the minds of several persons, not members of the society of Friends, that they petitioned parliament, for a longer respite than until the next day but one; when, according to the sentence, he was to be pilloried again, and burned in the forehead and tongue. The parliament accordingly granted a week's respite, namely, until the 27th. Encouraged probably by this, several other persons petitioned for the remission of the remainder of the sentence; which petition, as it is a specimen of the manner of the times, and contains also much good sense, and tokens of aversion from the practice of torturing the body, under pretence of mending the mind, I here insert.

‘ To the parliament of the Commonwealth of England, Scotland, and Ireland, &c.

‘ The humble petition of divers peaceable and well-affected persons in the cities of London and Westminster, in behalf of themselves and many others, sheweth,

‘ That your moderation and clemency in respiting the punishment of James Nayler, in consideration of his illness of body, hath refreshed the hearts of many thousands in these cities, altogether unconcerned in his practice; and hath opened their eyes to see *something more than the terrors of Mount Sinai, to dwell upon your honourable house*; and hath likewise given them some hopes to see you come forth in the Spirit of our Lord Jesus, yet more and more, to the convincement of those that err, and are out of the way. Wherefore we most humbly beg your pardon, that are constrained to appear before you in such a suit (not daring to do otherwise), that you would remit the remaining part of your sentence against James Nayler; leaving him to the Lord, and to such gospel remedies as He hath sanctified. And we are persuaded you will find such a course of love and forbearance more effectual to reclaim, and will leave a seal of your love and tenderness upon our spirits.’

‘ And we shall pray, &c.’

It is remarkable of this petition, which, as has been said, is a specimen of the manners of the times, that it, too, contains words which might, if a malevolent person were to interpret, be construed into blasphemy. It will easily be seen that I refer to the figure which would seem to erect the parliament

into a second Sinai. Such however was much the language of that day, a language which the loose manners of the Restoration laughed out of fashion; and which the more temperate manners of our own times, times when we are too careless about religion to be extravagant in it, forbid to become again the mode. All I here mean to infer is, that the Quakers should have their due share of allowance for the habits of the age in which they arose; and not that all we find in them, which varies from our present customs, should be charged to their peculiar principles.

With regard to the petition just mentioned, it was read and debated on; but the petitioners do not seem to have confided in it; for they endeavoured to support it by another, which they preferred to Cromwell. The protector thereon wrote to the house, and, by some words of his letter, seemed alarmed for his prerogative. He says, after having disclaimed the countenancing of such crimes as 'are' says he, 'commonly imputed' to Nayler, 'not knowing how far such a proceeding' (wholly without us) may extend in the consequence 'of it, we desire the house will let us know the grounds and reasons, whereupon they have proceeded.' The letter seems to have only occasioned a fruitless debate, and the time of Nayler's second suffering drawing near, the petitioners, on the 26th, applied again to Cromwell. All however seemed in vain, for, on the 27th, Nayler was conveyed from Newgate to the Old Exchange; stood two hours more with his head in the pillory, and was bored through the tongue and stigmatized. A few particulars respecting the execution of this part of the sentence, are material to relate. The boring iron and the mark, were red hot. The former

was held a small time in the tongue, that the bystanders might be witnesses of the execution, and the letter held to the forehead until smoke arose; during which time Nayler did not flinch; but, when he was unbound, he embraced the executioner. The fortitude and patience of the sufferer, may probably be shown by this recital; and, I think, a confirmation of the opinion that the parliament wanted to cast an odium on the Quakers, in the person of Nayler, is to be found in the circumstance about to be related. On the 18th December, the house had referred to a committee, the facts and crimes of the rest of the persons apprehended with him; and yet on the 27th, three at least of the women were so much at liberty, as to come up on the pillory, and seat themselves, two before, and one behind him. After execution, he was reconveyed to Newgate.

There is one occurrence which should not be omitted in taking a view of the case of Nayler; although I am not able to penetrate into the motives which occasioned it; the delegation of five ministers by the parliament, to confer with him: namely, Caryl, Manton, Nye, Griffiths, and Reynolds. They visited him on the 24th, which, being previous to the date of Cromwell's letter, forbids our supposing that the house had been moved by the Protector's intercession, and was seeking for grounds whereon to found its lenity. In this case too, its messengers, independent ministers, men whom Nayler and the Quakers in general were continually opposing, were not likely persons to effect his repentance. Could it be that the house was seeking further means of justifying a severity in which it determined to persist? The conduct, at least, of the visitors, is dubious; for they refused

that any witness should be present at their conference. Nayler, alarmed at this, refused to say any thing, unless they consented that what occurred should be written; and a copy signed by themselves left with him, or with the keeper of Newgate, where he then was. This was at first agreed to; but on Nayler's uttering these words, 'How soon have you forgot the work of the bishops, who are now found in the same, seeking to insnare the innocent,' they rose up, burned the papers, and departed. It appears however, from what James related of the conference, that he had persisted in renouncing the adoration of the creature, and in justifying his having omitted to reprove those who had bowed to what he esteemed the power of Christ in himself. In support of this, he had inquired of his examiners, whether Elisha had been guilty of blasphemy, in not reproving the Shunamite, when she fell at his feet.

About three weeks after his suffering the second part of the sentence at London, the third part, (namely, the ignominious exposure, and the second whipping), was inflicted at Bristol. It seems doubtful, from the account which I have followed in this part of Nayler's life, that the whipping was much more than formal, as a person is said to have been suffered to hold back the executioner's arm; but here a remarkable thing is related of one of Nayler's friends, whose name is so connected with the sufferings of the former, as not to be omitted in the relation of them. This was Robert Rich, a merchant of London. He had written to the speaker, previous to the sentence of the house; offering to prove, from Scripture, that nothing which Nayler had said or done, was blasphemy. On the day of Nayler's whipping in London, he had

stood at the door of the house, accosting the members as they entered, with texts of Scripture; he had cried to the court of Chancery, then sitting, 'The land mourns because of oppression;' and he had walked singing, from the door of the house, through Westminster-hall, to the pillory in Palace-yard, which confined his friend. When Nayler was again pilloried, and burnt in the forehead, he had kissed him, and licked his wound; and now, at Bristol, while Nayler was dragging after a cart-horse, and followed by the scourge, Rich rode before him bare-headed, and sung, 'Holy, Holy.' Rich, however, does not seem to have been eminent enough among the Quakers, for parliamentary animadversion. Rich remained without punishment. Nayler was sent from Bristol to his close confinement in Bridewell, London; where he remained a prisoner until the 8th of September, 1659, at which time he was liberated by parliament. On his liberation, he went to Bristol, the chief scene of his offence; at which city, in a public meeting, he made a confession of his fault in so affecting a manner, as to draw tears from most of those who were present; and to occasion his reconciliation with many who had been estranged from him. There is no doubt that he had made a good use of the solitude which his confinement afforded, and the alteration effected in his conduct towards his friends, the Quakers, quickly produced a return of their friendship and fellowship: so that he appears to have been as closely united to the body as before; and not to have occasioned in it any rent or schism, as has been insinuated.*

* Robert Barclay, in his piece called, 'William Mitchell unmasked,' has the following expressions concerning James Nayler. (See p. 84, of the folio edition of his work.) 'The story of James Nayler, which he subjoins, any may observe to be merely brought in to render us

A part of the sentence of Nayler, had been the deprivation of materials for writing. Nevertheless he certainly procured them, for he wrote and even published several pamphlets and papers during his imprisonment, some of them relating to his fall, and his restoration. The following extracts will show the temper of his mind, and his own opinion of his case.

‘ Dear brethren, my heart is broken this day for
 ‘ the offence that I have occasioned to God’s truth
 ‘ and people, and especially to you, who, in dear
 ‘ love, followed me, seeking me in faithfulness to
 ‘ God; which I rejected, being bound wherein I
 ‘ could not come forth, till God’s hand brought me,
 ‘ to whose love I now confess. Unless the Lord
 ‘ himself keep you from me, I beseech you let no-
 ‘ thing else hinder your coming to me, that I might
 ‘ have your help in the Lord. In the mercies of
 ‘ Christ Jesus, this I beg of you, as if it was your
 ‘ own case. Let me not be forgotten by you.’

The following was delivered to the parliament,
 ‘ Christ Jesus, the Immanuel, of whose sufferings
 ‘ the Scriptures declare, him alone I confess before
 ‘ men; for whose sake I have denied whatever
 ‘ was dear to me in this world, that I might win
 ‘ him, and be found in him, and not in myself,
 ‘ whose life and virtue I find daily manifest in my

‘ odious, and fill up the paper, though indeed it tends no ways to our
 ‘ disadvantage, he being in that thing, and at that time altogether
 ‘ denied by us; and has since in print freely acknowledged his fall in
 ‘ that hour of temptation; of whose sincere repentance and true
 ‘ return to the fellowship of the truth, we have had many evident
 ‘ tokens.’ And in p. 876, ‘Apology vindicated,’ in answer to an
 ‘ Examination by John Brown,’ &c. more at large. ‘But the
 ‘ poor man thinks (it is like) he has hit the nail on the head to
 ‘ purpose, when he says, p. 542, upon this subject, *One thing I would*
 ‘ *ask, what he thinketh of that honour and worship that was given to James*
 ‘ *Nayler, as he rode into Bristol, Oct. 24, 1656?* I answer, I think it was
 ‘ both wicked and abominable, and so do the People called Quakers;
 ‘ who thereupon disavowed him, and all those that had a hand in it.’

' mortal body (which is my eternal joy and hope of
 ' glory), whom alone I seek to serve in spirit, soul,
 ' and body, night and day, according to the
 ' measure of grace working in me, that in me he
 ' may be glorified, whether by life or death; and
 ' for his sake I suffer all things, that he alone may
 ' have the glory of my change, whose work alone
 ' is in me: even to that eternal Spirit be glory,
 ' and to the Lamb, for ever. But to ascribe this
 ' name, power, and virtue to James Nayler, or to
 ' that which had a beginning, and must return to
 ' dust; or for that to be exalted or worshipped;
 ' to me is a great idolatry, and with the spirit of
 ' Jesus in me it is condemned: which spirit leads
 ' to lowliness, meekness, and long-suffering. So,
 ' having an opportunity given, with readiness I am
 ' willing, in the fear of God the Father, in honour
 ' to Christ Jesus, and to take off all offences from
 ' every simple heart, this to declare to all the
 ' world, as the truth of Christ is in me, without
 ' guile or deceit: daily finding it to be my work to
 ' seek peace in truth with all men, in that Spirit.'

But the paper from which the following is extracted, seems to contain more respecting his judgment of those particular circumstances which have brought him into public notice, than any other: It was written soon after his release, and cannot, therefore, be suspected of being fabricated in order to obtain it.

' Glory to God Almighty who ruleth in the
 ' heavens, and in whose hands are all the kingdoms
 ' of the earth; who raiseth up and casteth down at
 ' his will; who hath ways to confound the exalta-
 ' tion of man, and to chastise his children, and to
 ' make man know himself to be as grass before
 ' him; whose judgments are above the highest of

' men, and his pity reacheth the deepest misery;
 ' and the arm of his mercy is underneath, to lift up
 ' the prisoner out of the pit, and to save such as
 ' trust in him from the great destruction, which
 ' vain man, through his folly, brings upon himself;
 ' who hath delivered my soul from darkness, and
 ' made way for my freedom out of the prison-
 ' house. Let his name be exalted for ever, and
 ' let all flesh fear before him, whose breath is life
 ' to his own, but a consuming fire to the adversary.
 ' And to the Lord Jesus Christ be everlasting do-
 ' minion upon earth; and his kingdom above all
 ' the powers of darkness; even that Christ of
 ' whom the Scriptures declare, which was, and is,
 ' and is to come, the light of the world to all ge-
 ' nerations; who hath been the rock of my sal-
 ' vation; and his Spirit hath given patience and
 ' quietness to my soul in deep affliction; even, for
 ' his name's sake, praises for ever!

' But condemned for ever be all those false wor-
 ' ships, with which any have idolized my person in
 ' the night of my temptation, when the power of
 ' darkness was above. All their casting of their
 ' clothes in the way, their bowings and singings,
 ' and all the rest of those wild actions, which did
 ' any ways tend to dishonour the Lord, or draw
 ' the minds of any from the measure of Christ
 ' Jesus in themselves, to look at flesh, which is as
 ' grass, or to ascribe that to the visible, which be-
 ' longs to Christ Jesus; all that I condemn, by
 ' which the pure name of the Lord hath been any
 ' ways blasphemed through me in the time of
 ' temptation; or the spirits of any people grieved,
 ' that truly loved the Lord Jesus, throughout the
 ' whole world, of what sort soever. This offence
 ' I confess, which hath been sorrow of heart, that

* the enemy of man's peace in Christ should get
 * this advantage in the night of my trial, to stir up
 * wrath and offences in the creation of God; a
 * thing, the simplicity of my heart did not intend,
 * the Lord knows, who, in his endless love, hath
 * given me power over it, to condemn it. And
 * also that letter which was sent to me to Exeter,
 * when I was in prison, with these words, *Thy*
 * *name shall be no more James Nayler, but Jesus;*
 * this I judge to be written from the imaginations,
 * and a fear struck me when I first saw it, and so I
 * put it in my pocket close, not intending any
 * should see it; which they finding on me, spread it
 * abroad; which the simplicity of my heart never
 * owned. So this I deny also, that the name of
 * Christ Jesus was received instead of James Nayler;
 * for that name is to the seed to all generations,
 * and he that hath the Son hath the name, which
 * is life and power, the salvation and the unction,
 * into which name all the children of light are bap-
 * tized. And all those ranting wild spirits, which
 * gathered about me in that time of darkness; and
 * all their wild actions and wicked words, against
 * the honour of God and his pure Spirit and
 * people, I deny that bad spirit, the power and the
 * works thereof: and as far as I gave advantage,
 * through want of judgment, for that evil spirit in
 * any to arise, I take shame to myself justly; having
 * formerly had power over that spirit in judgment
 * and discerning, wherever it was; which darkness
 * came over me through want of watchfulness and
 * obedience to the pure eye of God, and diligently
 * minding the reproof of life, which condemns the
 * adulterous spirit. And it is in my heart to con-
 * fess to God, and before men, my folly and
 * offence in that day. Yet there were many things

‘formed against me in that day to take away my
 ‘life, and bring scandal upon the truth, of which I
 ‘am not guilty at all: as that accusation, as if I
 ‘had committed adultery with some of those women
 ‘who came with us from Exeter prison, and also
 ‘those who were with me at Bristol, the night be-
 ‘fore I suffered there; of both which accusations
 ‘I am clear before God, who kept me in that day,
 ‘both in thought and deed, as to all women, as a
 ‘child, God is my record.’ After an exhortation
 to the reader, how to behave under temptation,
 and a warning against relying on gifts, wisdom, and
 knowledge, the piece concludes thus: ‘This I
 ‘have learned in the deep, and in secret, when I
 ‘was alone; and now openly declare, in the day
 ‘of thy mercy, O Lord! Glory to the Highest for
 ‘evermore, who hath thus far set me free, to
 ‘praise his righteousness, and his mercy, and to
 ‘the Eternal, Invisible, Pure God, over all, be
 ‘fear, obedience, and glory, evermore.’ Amen.

James Nayler did not long survive his imprisonment. He died in October 1660, and but little account is transmitted to us, respecting him, after his being set at liberty. George Whitehead, who lodged with him, at a house in London, in 1659 and 1660, bears this testimony of him, ‘that he
 ‘was revived by the Lord’s power, and in measure
 ‘restored to his ancient testimony, and to bear the
 ‘same publicly in divers parts of the nation, as the
 ‘Lord enabled him, both in his ministry and writ-
 ‘ings: and,’ adds Whitehead, ‘he walked in
 ‘much brotherly love and simplicity among us, until
 ‘his end came.’

* George Whitehead also mentions another circumstance respecting James Nayler, which I find difficult to understand, unless it be supposed that Nayler had occasional respites from his confinement. George

We have also a short account of Nayler, from Thomas Ellwood, who, before he became a member of the society of Friends, had met with him, while visiting at Isaac Penington's at Chalfont in Buckinghamshire. Edward Burrough, being also present, was discoursing with the father of Thomas Ellwood, respecting Predestination; which doctrine Ellwood the father espoused; when Nayler interposing, 'handled the subject with so much perspicuity and clear demonstration, that his reasoning seemed to be irresistible:' and this surprised young Ellwood the more, as the appearance of Nayler was that of a plain simple husbandman or shepherd.

Since the first arrival of James Nayler in London, in the year 1654, it doth not appear that he had ever revisited his habitation; if indeed, at all since the time of his quitting it in 1652. At length he set out homewards, and was noticed by a friend, as he passed through Huntingdon, to be in a frame of mind so awful, as that he appeared to be redeemed from the world. It is not known whether, soon after this he was suddenly taken ill, or had been robbed and abused. A countryman found him, in the latter part of the day, in a field near King's Rippon; and he was conveyed to the house of a friend at Holm. A physician attended him, and he was inquired of, whether he desired to see any of his London friends; which he declined. On having his clothes shifted, he said, 'You have refreshed my body, the Lord refresh your souls;'

Whitehead relates the manner of his fall, as he himself had related it when they were walking together in Westmoreland, in 1657; in which year, it appears, in Whitehead's life, that he was in that county; whilst, on the other hand, one of Nayler's papers is said to be written in Bridewell, in 1658; and it doth not seem that the date is an error of the press, and Whitehead was, as hath been mentioned, in London in 1659 and 1660.

not long after which he departed in peace, aged about 44 years. His remains were interred at Rippon. About two hours before his decease he is said to have uttered the following words :

‘ There is a spirit that I feel, that delights to do no
 ‘ evil, nor to revenge any wrong, but delights to
 ‘ endure all things, in hope to enjoy its own in the
 ‘ end. Its hope is to outlive all wrath and conten-
 ‘ tion, and to weary out all exaltation and cruelty,
 ‘ or whatever is of a nature contrary to itself. It
 ‘ sees to the end of all temptations : as it bears no
 ‘ evil in itself, so it conceives none in thoughts to
 ‘ any other. If it be betrayed, it bears it ; for its
 ‘ ground and spring is the mercies and forgiveness
 ‘ of God. Its crown is meekness, its life is ever-
 ‘ lasting love, unfeigned ; and takes its kingdom
 ‘ with intreaty, and not with contention, and keeps
 ‘ it by lowliness of mind. In God alone it can re-
 ‘ joice, though none else regard it, or can own its
 ‘ life. It is conceived in sorrow, and brought
 ‘ forth without any to pity it ; nor doth it murmur
 ‘ at grief and oppression. It never rejoiceth but
 ‘ through sufferings ; for with the world’s joy, it
 ‘ is murdered. I found it alone, being forsaken.
 ‘ I have fellowship therein with them who lived in
 ‘ dens, and desolate places of the earth : who,
 ‘ through death, obtained this resurrection, and
 ‘ eternal holy life.’

During the time of James Nayler’s travels and imprisonment, he had frequent recourse to the press. Some of his writings were doctrinal, and many of them controversial. Some of the latter contain an asperity of language, which appears ill adapted to convince either the opponent, or his adherents. The writings of Nayler, however, are not eminent for these ; and, in estimating how

far an author has exceeded the point of right, we should allow for the provocation; and great provocation was certainly given to our elder friends, by the misapprehension of their principles. This occasioned their adversaries to charge them with opinions (often monstrous enough) which they did not hold. Such however is the impatience of our minds, that we find it easier to cry down an opinion which clashes with our own, than to examine it with coolness; and to inveigh against its author, than to desire his instruction. While this is the case, debate is not likely to sift out truth; but when the time shall come that such as profess the name of Christ, shall infuse into their controversies all the gentleness, forbearance, and love, which his religion enjoins, it is probable that Christianity will be advanced, by the superior conviction which will attend the discussion of its votaries. May the mind that is convinced of these truths, suffer them to operate as a rule of its conduct; and thus be one to carry on the work which it desires to see accomplished. A collection was made in 1716, of such of Nayler's writings as were thought suitable for reimpression; but this has also been long since out of print.

On a review of the life and writings of James Nayler, he appears to have been a man of no mean abilities, and of great sincerity; but tinged with what will generally be esteemed an excess of credulity; not only as to his own gifts, but also in estimating the pretensions of others. But he seems remarkable for no quality more than for patience under suffering; and quiet resignation to what he believed to be Divinely enjoined or permitted. To this quality, as the means, we may attribute his

restoration to soundness of judgment, and the calmness of his closing moments.

After all, probably his life will be viewed through the medium which each one has been accustomed to use. The scoffer at religion will think him a fool; the deist a madman; the professor of religion, who measures all things by his finite unenlightened reason, and rejects the notion of Divine influence, will exult at his fall; but the believer in this influence, who counts the cost of his faith, and has descried the dangers of the right hand as well as of the left, will at least view his story with instruction; if not be induced by it to adhere more closely to that guide, which alone can preserve man from falling; but which repeated deviations may conceal from the view.

restoration to soundness of judgment, and the calm
 nets of his closing moments. All will be viewed
 through the medium which each one has been accus-
 tomed to use. The teacher of religion will think
 him a fool; the deist a madman; the professor of
 religion, who measures all things by his finite un-
 enlightened reason, and rejects the notion of Divine
 influence, will exult in his fall; but the believer in
 this influence, who counts the cost of his faith, and
 has despised the dangers of the night land as well
 as of the day, will - least view his story with in-
 distinction; it not be advanced by it to adhere more
 closely to that guide, which alone can preserve man
 from falling; but which repeated deviations may
 lead from the way.

A
SUMMARY

OF THE

HISTORY, DOCTRINE, AND DISCIPLINE,

OF

FRIENDS:

WRITTEN AT THE DESIRE

OF THE

MEETING FOR SUFFERINGS,

IN LONDON.

ADVERTISEMENT.

THIS Tract may be had separately ; also German and French Editions of it. A Translation into the Welsh Language is preparing for the Press.

INTRODUCTION.

ALTHOUGH more than a century hath elapsed since we became a distinct religious society; yet, from several causes, our principles at this day are frequently either not understood, or misrepresented. Many books, explanatory of our tenets and practices, have indeed been published by authors of our own profession. Some of these are more diffuse than every reader hath leisure or inclination to peruse; others, more compendious, do not extend to all the particulars which we ourselves wish to be known, or with which inquirers may desire to be acquainted. It is therefore judged expedient to present to such as are disposed to be rightly informed respecting us, a summary account of our origin and history, of our doctrines, and of our discipline; which may give the reader a true, though general, representation; and then, as leisure or inclination may allow or induce him, he may render his knowledge of us, and of our principles, more particular, by having recourse to some of the publications already hinted at. To such a purpose, among others, the works of George Fox, William Sewel, William Penn, and Robert Barclay, are well adapted: and to those who may be thus induced to inquire into our principles, we would

also recommend the example of the Bereans, who examined the Holy Scriptures to find if "those things were so." *

It may, however, be remarked, that the Gospel, which we believe to be the highest as well as the last dispensation of God to man, can never be so well understood, as when it is considered as having the boundless love of the Great Creator for its cause, and the salvation of the whole human race for its end and aim.

It seems to be time for the sincere in heart to waive the ceremonials of religion (concerning which there hath been enough of contention and animosity), for the sake of its essence. In proportion as men are gathered to the one thing needful, the government of Christ's Spirit in the heart, they lose the inclination for contention, and are in the true way to unity. Then can they breathe forth the primitive and permanent gospel-language, "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good-will toward men." †

* Acts xvii. 11.

† Luke ii. 14.

SUMMARY, &c.

CHAPTER I.

HISTORY.

THE beginning of the seventeenth century is known to have been a time of great dissention in England, respecting religion. Many pious persons had been dissatisfied with the settlement of the Church of England in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. Various societies of Dissenters had accordingly arisen; some of whom evinced their sincerity by grievous sufferings, under the intolerance of those who governed church affairs. (a) But these societies, notwithstanding their honest zeal, seem to have stopped short in their progress towards a complete reformation; (b) and, degenerating into formality, to have left their most enlightened members still to lament the want of something more instructive, and consolatory to the soul, than the most rigorous observance of their ordinances had ever produced. Thus dissatisfied and disconsolate, they were ready to follow any teacher, who seemed able

(a) Sewel, p. 5, 6. edit. 1722. (b) Penn, vol. 5, p. 211, 212. edit. 1782.

to direct them to that light and peace of which they felt the need. Many such in succession engaged their attention; until, finding the insufficiency of them all, they withdrew from the communion of every visible church; and dwelt retired, and attentive to the inward state of their own minds; often deeply distressed for the want of that true knowledge of God, which they saw to be necessary for salvation, and for which, according to their ability, they fervently prayed. These sincere breathings of spirit being answered by the extension of some degree of heavenly consolation, they became convinced, that as the heart of man is the scene of the tempter's attacks, it must also be that of the Redeemer's victory. With renewed fervency, therefore, they sought his appearance in their minds; and thus, being renewedly furnished with his saving light and help, they not only became instructed in the things pertaining to their own salvation; but they discovered many practices in the world, which have a shew of religion, to be nevertheless the effect of the unsubjected will of man, and inconsistent with the genuine simplicity of the Truth.

These people were at first hidden from each other, and each probably conceived his own heart to be the single repository of a discovery so important; but it did not consist with divine goodness, that the candle thus lighted should always remain under the bed, or the bushel. (c) Our honourable elder, G. Fox, who had signally experienced the afflicting dispensations which we have described, and had also been quickened by the immediate touches of divine love, could not satisfy his apprehensions of duty to God, without bearing

(c) Mark iv. 21.

public testimony against the common modes of worship, and directing the people where to find the like consolation and instruction. (*d*) As he travelled in this service, he met with divers of those seeking persons who had been exercised in a similar manner: these readily received his testimony; several of them also became preachers of the same doctrine; (*e*) multitudes were convinced of the reality of this inward manifestation; (*f*) and many meetings were settled.

Those who attempt to detach the people from the teachings of men, must expect for their enemies those men who make a gain of teaching. Such was the lot of our first friends: and laws, made either in the times of popery, or since the reformation against non-conformists, served as the means of gratifying the jealousy of the priests, and the intolerance of the magistrates. Indeed, at the time Friends first attracted public notice, legal pretences were not always thought necessary to justify the abuse which they suffered. (*g*) It was during the time of the commonwealth, when opposition to a national ministry which was supposed to be peculiarly reformed, was deemed an offence of no small import. Much personal abuse was accordingly bestowed; (*h*) imprisonment was common, and corporal punishment frequent. Imprisonment was often rendered more severe and disgusting by the cruelty of particular magistrates, and from the numbers which were confined together; and stripes, under pretence of vagrancy, were inflicted without regard to sex, and on persons of unimpeached character, and of good circumstances in the world. (*i*)

(*d*) Fox's Journal, p. 14, 15, 21. edit. 1765. (*e*) Ibid. 49. (*f*) 1 Cor. xiii. 7. (*g*) Fox 26. (*h*) Besse's Sufferings of the People called Quakers, ch. 6, and 29. and passim. (*i*) Ibid. Suff. pref. and passim.

George Fox (*k*) was one of the first of our Friends who was imprisoned. He was confined at Nottingham in the year 1649, for having publicly opposed a preacher, who had asserted that the more sure word of prophecy, mentioned 2 Pet. i. 19, was the Scripture; George Fox declaring that it was the Holy Spirit; and in the following year, being brought before two justices in Derbyshire, (*l*) one of them, scoffing at George Fox, for having bidden him, and those about him, to tremble at the word of the Lord, gave to our predecessors the name of *Quakers*; (*m*) an appellation which soon became and hath remained our most usual denomination; but they themselves adopted, and have transmitted to us, the endearing appellation of *Friends*.

Although Oliver Cromwell did not employ his authority to put a stop to persecution, it doth not appear that he was inclined to promote it. He gave several of our Friends access to him; and once in particular, when George Fox had been brought to him as a prisoner, (*n*) he released him after a considerable time spent in conference; on which occasion he confessed that our Friends were 'a people risen up that he could not win, either with gifts, honours, offices, or places.' (*o*)

Persecution however continued; but when Charles II. on the prospect of his restoration, issued from Breda, amongst other things, his declaration for liberty of conscience, it might well have been expected that Friends would be permitted to exercise their religion without molestation. Yet during this reign they not only were harrassed with the oath of allegiance, which, in common with all oaths, they scrupled to take, and by which they often incurred tedious imprisonment, and not unfrequently

(*k*) Fox, 24. (*l*) Ibid. 29. (*m*) Sewel, 25. (*n*) Ibid. 98. (*o*) Ibid. 99.

premunire:—but new laws (*p*) were made, by which even their meetings for worship subjected them to punishment.

The king, as a branch of the legislature, joined in the enacting of these laws; nevertheless he did not seem in all cases to countenance severity; for in an instance wherein he acted independently of the parliament, he was the means of affording relief in the most sanguinary persecution which our Friends ever experienced. This was in New England, where it was made penal for a friend even to reside.

The first friends (*q*) who arrived at Boston, were women. These were imprisoned, and otherwise cruelly treated. The date of this transaction is 1656. The following year the scourge was employed, and a woman (*r*) is also recorded to have been the first who suffered stripes. She was the wife of a tradesman in London, and had made a voyage to Boston, to warn the people against persecution. Great numbers underwent this punishment; but stripes proving insufficient, to deter our Friends from the exercise of their religious duty, in going to such places, and performing such services, as they believed to be required by the Divine will; it was next attempted to discourage them by a law (*s*) for cutting off their ears. This was executed in vain; and accordingly the intolerance of the persons in power produced another, which subjected Friends to banishment on pain of death. Their constancy, (*t*) however, was not thus to be shaken, and four friends, amongst whom also was a woman, were hanged at Boston.

(*p*) 16th Car. II. cap. 4. 22nd Car. II. cap. 1. Also 13th and 14th Car. II. cap. 1. (*q*) Sewel 160. (*r*) Ib. 170. (*s*) Ib. 194, 198 (*t*) Ib. 199, 226 to 235, 276.

In this extremity, Samuel Shattock, (*u*) a Friend who had been banished under the last mentioned law, came to England; and application being made to the king by Edward Burrough, who was admitted to a personal audience, Charles granted his mandamus (dated 9th September, 1661) to stop the severities in New England; and appointed Samuel Shattock his deputy, to carry it to Boston.

Nor were the good offices of Charles II. confined to our Friends of New England. Notwithstanding the continuance of persecution in England, the king generally appeared inclinable to grant relief, and frequently received the personal application of George Whitehead(*v*) and others, on behalf of their suffering brethren. In 1672, (*x*) he released, under the great seal, such friends as were imprisoned on account of the oath of allegiance, to the number of about four hundred; and the society had some respite from persecution; but, not being protected by law, persecutors and informers soon recommenced their oppression, and at the king's decease, about fifteen hundred were in prison, or prisoners. (*y*)

Although the practice of inflicting corporal punishment on Friends, seems in England to have fallen into disuse at the restoration; yet the reign of Charles II. must be considered as the time of the greatest suffering to our society. The imprisonments were long, often terminating only with the life of the prisoner. In this reign also, the crowds shut up together, increased, in many places, the common sufferings of confinement; which, in some, were also augmented by the violent tempers of magistrates, or by the barbarity of gaolers. The fines imposed by the new laws, were exacted with a rigour that gene-

(*u*) Sewel, 280, 281. (*v*) G. Whitehead's Life, passim. (*x*) Ibid page 353.
(*y*) Sewel, 586, 1684.

rally oppressed the sufferer, and sometimes left him nearly destitute of household goods; and several families experienced a separation of the near connexions of life, by the execution of that law (z) which subjected our Friends to banishment.

It is well known that James II. to favour (as is supposed) the religion to which he was attached, suspended the operation of the penal laws against dissenters. Our Friends had their share in the benefit arising from this measure; but it was not until the reign of king William, that they obtained some degree of legal protection. Besides their disuse of the national forms of worship, their refusing to swear and to pay tithes, had been among the principal causes of their sufferings. In the reign of William and Mary, an act was made, (a) which, with a few exceptions, allowed to their affirmation the legal force of an oath; and provided a less oppressive mode of recovering tithes, under a certain amount. These provisions were made perpetual in the reign of George I. (b) and thus Friends, who received the advantage of the act of toleration, in common with other dissenters, have been in a great measure relieved from persecution.

At the same time that the society in England experienced the vicissitudes which have been thus briefly mentioned, similar circumstances befel our Friends in Ireland. In that nation also, they propagated their principles, settled meetings, suffered persecution, and were at length relieved by law. (c)

The means of persecution, though now generally condemned by our countrymen, are not wholly

(z) 16 Car. II. c. 4. (a) 6th & 8th William III. c. 34. (b) 1st Geo. I. c. 6.

(c) Those who are desirous of particular information respecting Friends in Ireland, may consult Edmundson's Journal, and Ratty's History of the Rise and Progress of the People called Quakers.

removed; and we are still liable to suffer in the Exchequer, and in the Ecclesiastical court: but this must be understood only with respect to Great Britain and Ireland; for in America, the people at present are not bound to support a national ministry; nor, when this was in some parts the case, were methods of enforcing payment employed, so tedious and so severe as in England. (*d*).

It has already been mentioned, that our Friends above a century ago, had made their appearance in New England; from whence all the violence of their persecutors had not been able to expel them. They were also early to be found in other colonies, in divers of which they underwent persecution; but on the acquisition of Pennsylvania by William Penn, many of them were induced to remove into that new province; which soon became, and still remains to be, the largest settlement of Friends in America.—They are settled however in most of the other states and provinces of North America; and although they have enjoyed a great share of tranquillity, yet during the commotions which terminated in the separation of the United States from the dominion of Great Britain, Friends were involved in great trouble, by refusing to join in the military services which were required of them; and many were reduced, from circumstances of ease, if not of affluence, to the verge of want, by the excessive seizures which were made of their property, to recover the fines imposed for their refusing to serve personally, or by substitute, in war.

(*d*) It is worthy of remark, that in the province of Massachusetts, in which the most sanguinary laws had been made and put into execution against Friends, the first law was made exempting them from contributing to the support of the public ministry: an act of assembly having passed for that purpose in 1731, Jonathan Belcher being governor.

CHAPTER II.

DOCTRINE.

*General Belief. — Universal and saving Light. —
Worship. — Ministry. — Womens' preaching. — Bap-
tism and the Supper. — Universal Grace. — Perfection.
— Oaths and War. — Government. — Deportment. —
Conclusion.*

WE agree with other professors of the Christian name, in the belief of one eternal God, the Creator and Preserver of the universe; and in Jesus Christ his Son, the Messiah, and Mediator of the new covenant. (*a*)

When we speak of the gracious display of the love of God to mankind, in the miraculous conception, birth, life, miracles, death, resurrection, and ascension of our Saviour, we prefer the use of such terms as we find in Scripture; and contented with that knowledge which Divine wisdom hath seen meet to reveal, we attempt not to explain those mysteries which remain under the veil; nevertheless we acknowledge and assert the Divinity of Christ, who is the wisdom and power of God unto salvation. (*b*)

To Christ alone we give the title of the Word of God (*c*), and not to the Scriptures; although we highly esteem these sacred writings, in subordination to the Spirit (*d*), from which they were given forth; and we hold, with the apostle Paul, that they are able to make wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus. (*e*)

(*a*) Heb. xii. 24. (*b*) 1 Cor. i. 24. (*c*) John i. 1. (*d*) 2 Pet. i. 21.
(*e*) 2 Tim. iii. 15.

We reverence those most excellent precepts which are recorded in Scripture to have been delivered by our great Lord, and we firmly believe that they are practicable, and binding on every Christian; and that in the life to come, every man will be rewarded according to his works (*f*). And further it is our belief, that, in order to enable mankind to put in practice these sacred precepts, many of which are contradictory to the unregenerate will of man (*g*), every man coming into the world, is endued with a measure of the light, grace, or good Spirit of Christ; by which, as it is attended to, he is enabled to distinguish good from evil, and to correct the disorderly passions and corrupt propensities of his nature, which mere reason is altogether insufficient to overcome. For all that belongs to man is fallible, and within the reach of temptation; but this Divine grace, which comes by him who hath overcome the world (*i*), is, to those who humbly and sincerely seek it, an all-sufficient and present help in time of need. By this, the snares of the enemy are detected, his allurements avoided, and deliverance is experienced through faith in its effectual operation: whereby the soul is translated out of the kingdom of darkness, and from under the power of Satan, into the marvellous light and kingdom of the Son of God.

Being thus persuaded that man, without the Spirit of Christ inwardly revealed, can do nothing to the glory of God, or to effect his own salvation; we think this influence especially necessary to the performance of the highest act of which the human mind is capable; even the worship of the Father of lights and of spirits, in spirit and in truth: there-

(*f*) Mat. xvi, 27. (*g*) John i. 9. (*i*) Ibid. xvi. 33.

fore we consider as obstructions to pure worship, all forms which divert the attention of the mind from the secret influence of this unction from the Holy One (*k*). Yet, although true worship is not confined to time and place, we think it incumbent on Christians to meet often together (*l*), in testimony of their dependence on the Heavenly Father, and for a renewal of their spiritual strength: nevertheless, in the performance of worship, we dare not depend, for our acceptance with him, on a formal repetition of the words and experiences of others; but we believe it to be our duty to lay aside the activity of the imagination, and to wait in silence to have a true sight of our condition bestowed upon us: believing even a single sigh (*m*), arising from such a sense of our infirmities, and of the need we have of Divine help, to be more acceptable to God, than any performances, however specious, which originate in the will of man.

From what has been said respecting worship, it follows that the ministry we approve must have its origin from the same source: for that which is needful for man's own direction, and for his acceptance with God (*n*), must be eminently so to enable him to be helpful to others. Accordingly we believe that the renewed assistance of the light and power of Christ, is indispensably necessary for all true ministry; and that this holy influence is not at our command, or to be procured by study, but is the free gift of God to chosen and devoted servants. Hence arises our testimony against preaching for hire, in contradiction to Christ's positive command, "Freely ye have received, freely give;" (*o*) and hence our conscientious refusal to support such ministry, by tithes or other means.

(*k*) 1 John ii. 20. 27. (*l*) Heb. x. 25. (*m*) Rom. viii. 26.
 (*n*) Jer. xxiii. 30 to 32. (*o*) Matt. x. 8.

As we dare not encourage any ministry, but that which we believe to spring from the influence of the Holy Spirit, so neither dare we attempt to restrain this influence to persons of any condition in life, or to the male sex alone; but, as male and female are one in Christ, we allow such of the female sex as we believe to be endued with a right qualification for the ministry, to exercise their gifts for the general edification of the church: and this liberty we esteem a peculiar mark of the gospel dispensation, as foretold by the prophet Joel (*p*), and noticed by the apostle Peter (*q*).

There are two ceremonies in use among most professors of the Christian name, Water-baptism, and what is termed the Lord's Supper. The first of these is generally esteemed the essential means of initiation into the church of Christ; and the latter of maintaining communion with him. But as we have been convinced, that nothing short of his redeeming power, inwardly revealed, can set the soul free from the thralldom of sin; by this power alone we believe salvation to be effected. We hold that as there is one Lord and one faith, (*r*) so his baptism is one, in nature and operation; that nothing short of it can make us living members of his mystical body; and that the baptism with water, administered by his fore-runner John, belonged, as the latter confessed, to an inferior and decreasing dispensation. (*s*)

With respect to the other rite, we believe that communion between Christ and his church is not maintained by that, nor any other external performance, but only by a real participation of his Divine nature (*t*) through faith; that this is the supper

(*p*) Joel ii. 28, 29. (*q*) Acts ii. 16, 17. (*r*) Eph. iv. 5.
 (*s*) John iii. 30. (*t*) 2 Pet. i. 4.

alluded to in the Revelation (*u*), "Behold I stand
 " at the door and knock: if any man hear my
 " voice, and open the door, I will come in to him,
 " and will sup with him, and he with me;" and that
 where the substance is attained, it is unnecessary to
 attend to the shadow; which doth not confer grace,
 and concerning which, opinions so different, and
 animosities so violent, have arisen.

Now, as we thus believe that the grace of God,
 which comes by Jesus Christ, is alone sufficient for
 salvation, we can neither admit that it is conferred
 on a few only, whilst others are left without it;
 nor, thus asserting its universality, can we limit its
 operation to a partial cleansing of the soul from sin,
 even in this life. We entertain worthier notions
 both of the power and goodness of our Heavenly
 Father, and believe that he doth vouchsafe to assist
 the obedient to experience a total surrender of the
 natural will, to the guidance of his pure unerring
 Spirit; through whose renewed assistance they are
 enabled to bring forth fruits unto holiness, and to
 stand perfect in their present rank. (*x*)

There are not many of our tenets more gene-
 rally known than our testimony against Oaths, and
 against War. With respect to the former of these,
 we abide literally by Christ's positive injunction,
 delivered in his sermon on the mount, "Swear
 " not at all." (*y*) From the same sacred collection
 of the most excellent precepts of moral and reli-
 gious duty, from the example of our Lord himself,
 (*z*) and from the correspondent convictions of his
 Spirit in our hearts, we are confirmed in the
 belief that wars and fightings are, in their origin
 and effects, utterly repugnant to the gospel; which

(*u*) Rev. viii. 20. (*x*) Matt. v. 48. Eph. iv. 13. Col. iv. 12. (*y*) Matt. v. 34.
 (*z*) Mat. v. 39, 44, &c. ch. xxvi. 52, 53. Luke xxii. 51. John xviii. 11.

still breathes peace and good-will to men. We also are clearly of the judgment, that if the benevolence of the Gospel were generally prevalent in the minds of men, it would effectually prevent them from oppressing, much more enslaving, their brethren (of whatever colour or complexion), for whom, as for themselves, Christ died; and would even influence their conduct in their treatment of the brute creation: which would no longer groan, the victims of their avarice, or of their false ideas of pleasure.

Some of our tenets have in former times, as hath been shewn, subjected our Friends to much suffering from Government, though to the salutary purposes of Government, our principles are a security. They inculcate submission to the laws in all cases wherein conscience is not violated. But we hold, that as Christ's kingdom is not of this world, it is not the business of the civil magistrate to interfere in matters of religion; but to maintain the external peace and good order of the community. We therefore think persecution, even in the smallest degree, unwarrantable. We are careful in requiring our members not to be concerned in illicit trade, nor in any manner to defraud the revenue.

It is well known that the society, from its first appearance, has disused those names of the months and days, which having been given in honour of the heroes or false gods of the heathen, originated in their flattery or superstition; and the custom of speaking to a single person in the plural number, as having arisen also from motives of adulation. Compliments, superfluity of apparel and furniture, outward shews of rejoicing and mourning, and the observation of days and times, we esteem to be

incompatible with the simplicity and sincerity of a Christian life; and public diversions, gaming, and other vain amusements of the world, we cannot but condemn. They are a waste of that time which is given us for nobler purposes; and divert the attention of the mind from the sober duties of life, and from the reproofs of instruction, by which we are guided to an everlasting inheritance.

To conclude, although we have exhibited the several tenets which distinguish our religious society, as objects of our belief; yet we are sensible that a true and living faith is not produced in the mind of man by his own effort; but is the free gift of God (*a*) in Christ Jesus, nourished and increased by the progressive operation of his Spirit in our hearts, and our proportionate obedience. (*b*) Therefore, although for the preservation of the testimonies given us to bear, and for the peace and good order of the society, we deem it necessary that those who are admitted into membership with us, should be previously convinced of those doctrines which we esteem essential; yet we require no formal subscription to any articles, either as a condition of membership, or a qualification for the service of the church. We prefer the judging of men by their fruits, and depending on the aid of Him, who, by his prophet, hath promised to be "a spirit of judgment to him that sitteth in judgment." (*c*) Without this, there is a danger of receiving numbers into outward communion, without any addition to that spiritual sheep-fold, whereof our blessed Lord declared himself to be both the door and the shepherd; (*d*) that is, such as know his voice, and follow him in the paths of obedience.

(*a*) Eph. ii. 8. (*b*) John vii. 17. (*c*) Isaiah xxviii. 6. (*d*) John x. 7. 11.

CHAPTER III.

DISCIPLINE.

Its Purposes.—Meetings for Discipline.—MONTHLY MEETINGS.—Poor.—Convinced Persons.—Certificates of Removal.—Overseers.—Mode of dealing with Offenders.—Arbitration.—Marriages.—Births and Burials.—QUARTERLY MEETINGS.—Queries.—Appeals.—THE YEARLY MEETING.—Women's Meetings.—Meetings of Ministers and Elders.—Certificates to Ministers.—THE MEETING FOR SUFFERINGS.—Conclusion.

THE purposes which our discipline hath chiefly in view, are, the relief of the poor,—the maintenance of good order,—the support of the testimonies which we believe it is our duty to bear to the world,—and the help and recovery of such as are overtaken in faults.

In the practice of discipline, we think it indispensable that the order recommended by Christ himself be invariably observed: (a) “If thy brother
“ shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his
“ fault between thee and him alone: if he shall
“ hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother; but if
“ he will not hear thee, then take with thee one
“ or two more, that in the mouth of two or three

(a) Mat. xviii. 15 to 17.

“witnesses, every word may be established: and if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the church.”

To effect the salutary purposes of discipline, meetings were appointed, at an early period of the society, which, from the times of their being held, were called Quarterly-meetings. It was afterwards found expedient *(e)* to divide the districts of those meetings, and to meet more frequently; from whence arose Monthly-meetings, subordinate to those held quarterly. At length, in 1669, *(f)* a Yearly-meeting was established, to superintend, assist, and provide rules for, the whole: previously to which, general meetings had been occasionally held.

A Monthly-meeting is usually composed of several particular congregations, *(g)* situated within a convenient distance from each other. Its business is to provide for the subsistence of the poor, and for the education of their offspring; to judge of the sincerity and fitness of persons appearing to be convinced of the religious principles of the society, and desiring to be admitted into membership; *(h)* to excite due attention to the discharge of religious and moral duty; and to deal with disorderly members. Monthly meetings also grant to such of their members as remove into other Monthly-meetings certificates of their membership and conduct; without which they cannot gain membership in such meet-

(e) Sewel, 485. *(f)* Fox, 390.

(g) Where this is the case, it is usual for the members of each congregation to form what is called a Preparative meeting, because its business is to prepare whatever may occur among themselves, to be laid before the Monthly-meeting.

(h) On application of this kind, a small committee is appointed to visit the party, and report to the Monthly-meeting; which is directed by our rules not to admit any into membership, without allowing a reasonable time to consider their conduct.

ings. Each Monthly-meeting is required to appoint certain persons, under the name of overseers, who are to take care that the rules of our discipline be put in practice; and when any case of complaint, or disorderly conduct, comes to their knowledge, to see that private admonition, agreeably to the gospel rule before-mentioned, be given, previously to its being laid before the Monthly-meeting.

When a case is introduced, it is usual for a small committee to be appointed, to visit the offender, to endeavour to convince him of his error, and to induce him to forsake and condemn it (*i*). If they succeed, the person is by minute declared to have made satisfaction for the offence; if not, he is disowned as a member of the society. (*k*)

In disputes between individuals, it has long been the decided judgment of the society, that its members should not sue each other at law. It therefore enjoins all to end their differences by speedy and impartial arbitration, agreeably to rules laid down. If any refuse to adopt this mode, or, having adopted it, to submit to the award, it is the direction of the Yearly-meeting that such be disowned.

To Monthly-meetings also belongs the allowing of marriages; for our Society hath always scrupled to acknowledge the exclusive authority of the priests in the solemnization of marriage. Those who intend to marry appear together and propose their intention to the Monthly-meeting; and if not attended by their parents and guardians, produce

(*i*) This is generally done by a written acknowledgment, signed by the offender.

(*k*) This is done by what is termed a Testimony of denial: which is a paper reciting the offence, and sometimes the steps which have led to it; next, the means unavailingly used to reclaim the offender; after that, a clause disowning him; to which is usually added an expression of desire for his repentance, and for his being restored to membership.

a written certificate of their consent, signed in the presence of witnesses. The meeting then appoints a committee to inquire whether they be clear of other engagements respecting marriage; and if at a subsequent meeting, to which the parties also come and declare the continuance of their intention, no objections be reported, they have the meeting's consent to solemnize their intended marriage. This is done in a public meeting for worship, towards the close whereof the parties stand up, and solemnly take each other for husband and wife. A certificate of the proceedings is then publicly read, and signed by the parties, and afterwards by the relations and others as witnesses. Of such marriage the Monthly-meeting keeps a record; as also of the births and burials of its members. A certificate of the date, of the name of the infant, and of its parents, signed by those present at the birth, is the subject of one of these last-mentioned records; and an order for the interment, countersigned by the grave-maker of the other. The naming of children is without ceremony. Burials are also conducted in a simple manner. The body, followed by the relations and friends, is sometimes, previously to interment, carried to a meeting; and at the grave a pause is generally made; on both which occasions it frequently falls out, that one or more friends present have somewhat to express for the edification of those who attend; but no religious rite is considered as an essential part of burial.

Several Monthly-meetings compose a Quarterly-meeting. At the Quarterly-meeting are produced written answers from the Monthly-meetings, to certain queries respecting the conduct of their members, and the meetings' care over them. The ac-

counts thus received, are digested into one, which is sent, also in the form of answers to Queries, by representatives, to the Yearly-meeting. Appeals from the judgment of Monthly-meetings, are brought to the Quarterly-meetings; whose business also it is to assist in any difficult case, or where remissness appears in the care of the Monthly-meetings over the individuals who compose them.

The Yearly-meeting has the general superintendence of the Society in the country in which it is established; (l) and therefore, as the accounts which it receives discover the state of inferior meetings, as particular exigencies require, or as the meeting is impressed with a sense of duty, it gives forth its advice, makes such regulations as appear to be requisite, or excites to the observance of those already made; and sometimes appoints committees to visit those Quarterly-meetings which appear to be in need of immediate advice. Appeals from the judgment of Quarterly-meetings are here finally determined; and a brotherly correspondence, by epistles, is maintained with other Yearly-meetings. (m)

In this place it is proper to add, that, as we believe women may be rightly called to the work of the ministry, we also think that to them belongs a share in the support of our Christian discipline; and that some parts of it, wherein their own sex is concerned, devolve on them with peculiar propriety: accordingly they have Monthly, Quarterly, and Yearly meetings of their own sex, held at the same time and in the same place with those of the men; but separately, and without the power of

(l) There are seven Yearly-meetings, viz. 1 London, to which come Representatives from Ireland, 2 New-England, 3 New-York, 4 Pennsylvania and New Jersey, 5 Maryland, 6 Virginia, 7 The Carolinas and Georgia.

(m) See the last note.

making rules : and it may be remarked that during the persecutions, which in the last century occasioned the imprisonment of so many of the men, the care of the poor often fell on the women, and was by them satisfactorily administered.

In order that those who are in the situation of ministers may have the tender sympathy and counsel of those of either sex, (*n*) who, by their experience in the work of religion, are qualified for that service, the Monthly-meetings are advised to select such under the denomination of Elders. These, and ministers approved by their Monthly-meetings, (*o*) have meetings peculiar to themselves, called Meetings of Ministers and Elders ; in which they have an opportunity of exciting each other to a discharge of their several duties, and of extending advice to those who may appear to be weak, without any needless exposure. Such meetings are generally held in the compass of each Monthly, Quarterly, and Yearly-meeting. They are conducted by rules prescribed by the Yearly-meeting, and have no authority to make any alteration or addition to them. The members of them unite with their brethren in the Meetings for discipline, and are equally accountable to the latter for their conduct.

It is to a meeting of this kind in London, called the Second-day's Morning-meeting, that the revival of manuscripts concerning our principles, previously to publication, is intrusted by the Yearly-meeting held in London ; and also the granting,

(*n*) Fox, 461, 492.

(*o*) Those who believe themselves required to speak in meetings for worship, are not immediately acknowledged as ministers by their Monthly-meetings ; but time is taken for judgment, that the meeting may be satisfied of their call and qualification. It will also sometimes happen, that such as are not approved, will obtrude themselves as ministers, to the grief of their brethren ; but much forbearance is used towards these, before the disapprobation of the meeting is publicly testified.

in the intervals of the Yearly-meeting, of certificates of approbation to such ministers as are concerned to travel in the work of the ministry in foreign parts; in addition to those granted by their Monthly and Quarterly meetings. When a visit of this kind doth not extend beyond Great Britain, a certificate from the Monthly meeting of which the minister is a member is sufficient; if to Ireland, the concurrence of the Quarterly meeting is also required. Regulations of similar tendency obtain in other Yearly meetings.

The Yearly-meeting of London, in the year 1675, appointed a meeting to be held in that city, for the purpose of advising and assisting in cases of suffering for conscience sake, which hath continued with great use to the society to this day. It is composed of friends under the name of correspondents, chosen by the several Quarterly-meetings, and who reside in or near the city. The same meetings also appoint members of their own in the country as correspondents, who are to join their brethren in London on emergency. The names of all these correspondents, previously to their being recorded as such, are submitted to the approbation of the Yearly-meeting. Those of the men who are approved ministers are also members of this meeting, which is called the Meeting for Sufferings; a name arising from its original purpose, which is not yet become entirely obsolete.

The Yearly-meeting has intrusted the Meeting for Sufferings with the care of printing and distributing books, and with the management of its stock; (p) and, considered as a standing committee of

(p) This is an occasional voluntary contribution, expended in printing books,—house-rent for a clerk, and his wages for keeping records,—the passage of ministers who visit their brethren beyond sea,—and some small incidental charges.

the Yearly-meeting, it hath a general care of whatever may arise, during the intervals of that meeting, affecting the society, and requiring immediate attention : particularly of those circumstances which may occasion an application to Government.

There is not in any of the meetings which have been mentioned, any president, as we believe that Divine Wisdom alone ought to preside ; nor hath any member a right to claim pre-eminence over the rest. The office of clerk, with a few exceptions, is undertaken voluntarily by some member ; as is also the keeping of the records. Where these are very voluminous, and require a house for their deposit (as is the case in London, where the general records of the society in Great Britain are kept,) a clerk is hired to have the care of them ; but except a few clerks of this kind, and persons who have the care of meeting-houses, none receive any stipend or gratuity for their services in our religious society.

Thus have we given a view of the foundation and establishment of our discipline ; by which it will be seen, that it is not (as hath been frequently insinuated) merely the work of modern times ; but was the early care and concern of our pious predecessors. We cannot better close this short sketch of it, than by observing, that if the exercise of discipline should in some instances appear to press hard upon those, who, neglecting the monitions of divine counsel in their hearts, are also unwilling to be accountable to their brethren ; yet, if that great, leading, and indispensable rule, enjoined by our Lord, be observed by those who undertake to be active in it, “ Whatsoever ye would that men “ should do to you, do ye even so to them,” (q)

(q) Matt. vii. 12.

it will prevent the censure of the church from falling on any thing but that which really obstructs the progress of Truth. Discipline will then promote, in an eminent degree, that love of our neighbour, which is the mark of discipleship, and without which a profession of love to God, and to his cause, is a vain pretence. "He," said the beloved disciple, "that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen? And this commandment have we from him, that he who loveth God, love his brother also." (r)

(r) 1 John iv. 20. 21.

FINIS.

It is mentioned at page 17, that A. MACLAINE is a Briton: since this Pamphlet was printed, the Author has been informed he is a native of Ireland; also, that he resided abroad when he made his translation of Mosheim's History.

London: Printed by Wm. Phillips, George Yard, Lombard Street.



